National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# TEACHERS AND STANDARDIZED TESTING: A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES, OPINIONS AND FEELINGS

*By*

*TOFAEL H. CHOWDHURY*

**A THESIS**

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

**MASTER OF EDUCATION**

**IN**

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**EDMONTON, ALBERTA**

**FALL, 1987**

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-41163-5

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
REALEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Tofael H. Chowdhury

TITLE OF THESIS: Teachers and Standardized Testing: A Survey of Attitudes, Opinions and Feelings.

DEGREE: Master of Education.

YEAR THIS DEGREE OBTAINED: 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

.....
(Student's Signature)

(Student's Permanent Address)

8421 - 36 Avenue,
Edmonton, Alberta
T6K 0J7

Date: 14th October, 1987

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculy of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Teachers and Standardized Testing: A Survey of Attitudes, Opinions and Feelings", submitted by Tofael H. Chowdhury in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

M. Rodda

Supervisor

P Mulcahy

David H Wangler

Date: 14th October, 1987

## ABSTRACT

The general goal of this research was to explore teachers' general opinions and feelings about standardized school testing program and their opinions concerning the usefulness of standardized test results for various purposes. A sample of 350 teachers in grades K-12 from the urban school system of Alberta were surveyed regarding their general attitudes, opinions and feelings towards standardized tests and other assessment methods that contribute to the improvement of instruction. Teachers gave their opinion on: familiarity with and experience in administering and scoring standardized tests, the accuracy, fairness, and usefulness of such tests, the amount of standardized testing in their schools, the kinds of information such standardized testing yields, particular uses of standardized test results and the usefulness of a variety of possible application of such test results as well as other test related policies. The teachers were instructed to base their answer on their attitudes toward standardized tests in general. Data were presented according to teacher's grade level (K-6, 7-9, 10-12) and total sample. Generally, teachers attitudes toward standardized tests were found to be positive. A majority of the teachers indicated that they were familiar with and experienced in administering and scoring standardized tests. The teachers' opinions about the amount of testing in their system were generally found to be satisfactory. Specific uses and applications of test results were also indicated. This study also sought the views of teachers regarding the advantages and limitations of standardized testing program and it was indicated that teachers see more advantages of standardized tests rather than disadvantage. Results also indicated that educators were interested in standardized tests and eager to learn. Our findings indicate that teachers seem to be

generally supportive of standardized tests, and understand the need for quality standards in education. They want to make some changes in order to make standardized testing more effective rather than to see it abolished from the school.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my appreciation to those people who have contributed to the development of this study.

I am sincerely grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Michael Rodda for giving so generously of his valuable time, for his patience and scholarship, editorial aid, and gentle reminders to complete this thesis. Particular thanks is due to Dr. Robert F. Mulcahy, a member of my committee for his advice and constructive criticism and also for his assistance in the design and collection of the data. Thanks are also extended to Dr. David G. Wangler as a member of the thesis committee.

I wish to express my appreciation to the teachers who participated in the survey for without them the study could not have been conducted.

Finally, the patience and encouragement of my wife, Nadira, throughout the entire endeavour is most certainly valued.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2. | LITERATURE REVIEW ON STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT | 5 |
| | Criticisms of Testing | 5 |
| | Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude Tests | 14 |
| 3. | METHODOLOGY | 20 |
| | The Study | 20 |
| | Survey Instrument | 20 |
| | Sample and Procedures | 21 |
| | Data Analysis | 21 |
| 4. | RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION | 22 |
| | ELEMENTARY TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES | 22 |
| | Teacher Opinions About the Student Profile Cards | 23 |
| | Teachers' Knowledge and Familiarity with the Standardized Tests | 25 |
| | Opinions Concerning the Source of Learning About the Tests | 27 |
| | The Current Uses of Standardized Testing | 28 |
| | Important Uses of Standardized Test Results | 30 |
| | Advantage or Disadvantage of Standardized Tests. | 31 |
| | Opinions Concerning the Assesibility of Standardized Tests. | 32 |
| | Opinions Concerning the Best Use of the Intelligence Tests Results | 32 |
| | Teacher Preferences to have the Standardized Tests Information | 33 |
| | Teacher Opinions Concerning the Standardized Testing Procedures | 34 |
| | Summary: Elementary and Junior High School Teachers | 35 |
| | HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES | 36 |

Familiarity With and Understanding the Meaning of the Standardized Tests Results....37
High School Teachers' Access to Standardized Tests....37
Teachers' Opinions Concerning the Sources of Learning About the Tests....37
The Current Uses of Standardized Tests in the High School....38
Teachers' Interests in Learning About the Standardized Tests....38
The Extention of Student Profile Card to High Schools....39
Opinions Concerning The Usefulness of Standardized Tests....39
Areas Assessed With Standardized Tests....39
Preferences to have the Standardized Tests Information....40
Opinions Concerning the Uses of Standardized Test Results....40
Summary: High School Teachers....40
5. GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION....42
RECOMMENDATIONS....48
REFERENCES....50
APPENDIXES....54
A. Elementary To Junior High School Teachers' Respons....55
B. High School Teachers' Responses....87
C. Elementary And Junior High School Teacher Questionnaire....96
D. High School Teachers Questionnaire....103

## LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Total Number of Teachers Responding | 23 |
| II. | Teachers' Knowledge and Familiarity With the Standardized Tests Results | 26 |
| III. | Availability of Tests to Administer in the School | 27 |
| IV. | Sources From Where Teachers Can Learn MoreAbout the Tests | 28 |
| V. | Current Uses of Standardized Tests in the School | 29 |
| VI. | Important Uses of Standardized Tests Results | 30 |
| VII. | Uses of Test Information to Compare Students' Performance in the System | 31 |
| VIII. | Advantage or Disadvantage of Standardized Tests | 32 |
| IX. | Best Use of the Results From the Group Intelligence Tests | 33 |
| X. | Standardized Testing Procedures are a Beneficial Asset | 34 |
| XI. | Opinions About Abolishing Standardized Tests | 35 |

# Chapter-1

## INTRODUCTION

Educators have always been concerned with measuring and evaluating the progress of their students. One of the aims is to obtain data which will help a student understand himself and develop in socially acceptable ways. The task of the teacher is to make available to the student as much information as possible, not only about the student but also about the world in which the student must operate. Standardized measures represent one source of information for making sound educational decisions. This study provides information and recommendations about the use of standardized tests in the Alberta urban school system.

Much of the current controversy about testing in schools focuses on the use of norm-referenced standardized tests - that is, tests in which the procedure, materials, and scoring have been fixed, and an individual's performance is interpreted in terms of the "normal" or average performance of a reference group (see Anastasi, 1954; Cronbach,1949). Those who see such tests as beneficial argue that, when used properly, they have many advantages since they are more "objective" and reliable than other, more impressionistic measures of student attainment. Thus, for teachers and counsellers they are a source of information about students, individually and in groups, that can be helpful in teaching and in student guidance. Tests can also be of assistance to administrators as well as teachers in monitoring the educational programs of schools, and in evaluating the effectiveness of new curricula, instructional materials and teaching methods. Finally when test information is given to students and parents, it can act as a source of motivation and contribute to the improvement of student's learning and the enhancement of their self-concepts (see Bloom,1969; Ebel,1977; Tyler, 1968,1969).

There has been an increased use of standardized tests in education. Educators are becoming increasingly aware of the role of standardized tests in instructional, guidance, administrative, and research functions. For tests to be helpful in decision making,

it is necessary that they be chosen properly, administered correctly, and interpreted accurately. For decision making, teachers are required to administer standardized tests, evaluate the results of such tests, and interpret the results to curious and sometimes concerned parents. Thus, it is necessary that we spend time getting to know the advantages, limitations, and use of standardized tests, from teachers' point of view.

The increased use of testing in the schools for educational accountability -- determining student competence and teacher/program effectiveness--has stimulated considerable research regarding teachers' perceptions and use of tests in the classroom. Much of this research has focused on the classroom teacher's use of standardized achievement and aptitude tests for grouping children according to their abilities for instructional purposes, for counselling pupils and parents, and for a variety of other purposes, including identifying pupils with special educational deficiencies and strengths. It is generally acknowledged that standardized tests in current use are less than perfect instruments for evaluating a given individual's capabilities. But according to Lavin (1965),there is strong evidence that in many instances they are better than alternative methods and, in most cases, used in conjunction with pupil grades, they increase the likelihood of making accurate predictions of a pupil's future academic performance.

Teachers play a central role in most school standardized testing programs. Teachers administer the tests, and they receive the results. The teachers' reactions to and use of information derived from testing may be the key element in effecting students' self-confidence, self-concept or scholastic achievement. In this study we examine teachers' reactions to standardized tests, including information on their reported use of test information and their general attitudes toward and beliefs about standardized testing as a method of evaluation.

Presumably, the ways in which test information is used in classrooms and the consequent effect that these uses have on pupils, curriculum and classroom climate will, to some extent, be a function of the favorableness of teachers' attitudes toward tests. If teachers perceive standardized tests and the constructs measured by them to be inaccurate, biased, unstable, or unimportant, they probably will be less likely to utilize test results in a practical way than if they perceive tests in a more favorable light. Thus, the opinions that teachers hold about standardized tests, and their use comprise a major dimension in a complex of variables influencing the way in which standardized tests are actually used. In this approach to the general question of the role of teachers in standardized school testing program, one may assume that the attitudes and opinions held by a teacher would directly affect the teacher's use of tests, his/her interpretation of test scores, and ultimately, the impact that a test might have on the student who took it. It is clear from the above description that teachers' attitudes and opinions about standardized tests are of considerable interest in their own right.

As can be seen from the previous description, there is a need for an objective type of research concerning teachers' attitudes toward and opinions and beliefs about standardized school testing program. Considering this need, a research study to gather more objective data concerning the attitudes of teachers toward the use of standardized tests was planned and executed in the winter of 1986. Its main purpose was to measure elementary to high school teachers' attitudes toward the standardized testing programs in their school districts, as well as to explore their general opinions and feelings about standardized achievement and aptitude tests that have been using in making educational decisions about pupils. The study designed primarily as survey of standardized tests, and it may serve as a source of information for educators, school administrators, psychologists, counsellors and other persons concerned with testing.

The study provides a description of the effects that testing and the provision of test information had on teachers' attitudes toward and beliefs about standardized tests. It elicites their perceptions of the accuracy of standardized tests, the best uses of intelligence tests results,and the relevance and effects of standardized testing; we would also explore opinions about the uses to which test information is put, and to indicate their attitudes toward general educational issues. The survey also examines teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of tests and their reported use of test information.

# Chapter-2

## LITERATURE REVIEW ON STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT

Broadly conceived, the main purpose of classroom teaching is to change behavior in desired directions. The "desired directions" are the educational objectives established by the school and the teacher; evaluation is the process of determining the extent to which these objectives are being achieved. Today, schools test to determine how well their students learn what the schools think is being taught. This information is used by teachers, administrators, and educational specialists to help determine the effectiveness of educational programs and what additions or changes can be made that will benefit the student. Schools use a wide variety of tests in an attempt to determine how well their students are doing. These range from teacher developed classroom tests designed to measure the content of daily lessons to the administration and utilization of the results of various types of standardized tests such as achievement, aptitude and intelligence tests and interest inventories. If school testing programs are intended to "help students learn better", those programs must measure some aspect of what is being learned (achievement) and what capacity exists for learning (academic aptitude). This study will focus on the use of these two types of standardized tests: achievement and aptitude tests. In this chapter, the writer reviews major criticisms of testing including the research reports concerning the beliefs, attitudes and opinions teachers hold about standardized tests. This is followed by a more specific look at achievement and aptitude tests.

### CRITICISMS OF TESTING

Recent years have seen harsh criticism of school testing programs. Three major areas of concern have emerged: the misuse of test data by inexperienced test users; the

"unfairness" of standardized test to minority and culturally disadvantaged groups, and the issue of the invasion of privacy. Much has been written about incorrect interpretation of standardized test data and the use of standardized test data in grouping and placing students for instructional purposes. Test data have been misunderstood and a lack of knowledge about tests has resulted in the misuse of test data. However, the answer is not to eliminate testing, but rather to instruct school personnel in the correct interpretation and appropriate uses of test data. Testing plays too important a role in the instructional activities of the school to be eliminated (Tollefson, 1975). Indeed, the response to criticisms of testing has emphasized the need to improve tests rather than abandon them (e.g., Ebel, 1966; Tyler, 1968; Tyler and White, 1979).

Mehrens and Leehmann (1969) speak to the critics of testing when they write: "Many people criticize the faulty decision made through misusing test information. Fewer people realize that a far more costly misuse of tests is not to give them at all. Even if only a few more students make better decision with the help of test information than they would have made without that information, the long-term benefits usually far outweigh the initial costs of testing." (pp. 280-281)

Ebel (1972) also discusses the importance of testing and evaluating procedures. "To teach without evaluating the results of teaching would be foolish. Those who suggest that schools do not need tests, or might even do a better job of educating students if tests were prohibited, seldom go so far as to argue that evaluation is not needed... If tests were abandoned, some other means of assessing educational achievement would have to be used in their place. No other means that is as efficient, as dependable and as beneficial to the process of education has yet been discovered" (p. 41).

Testing is a very valuable tool for education, parents and the community when it comes to making decisions about programs for students and schools. When properly used,

test information can help teachers create educational plans designed to overcome areas of academic weakness or to build on specific strengths. Test information can be used by school administrators to make decisions about where resources should be applied to meet educational needs.

Shertzer and Linden (1979) found that testing programs which provide "measurement data, are indispensible in evaluating the progress of students toward educational goals, and they can aid in making administrative decisions concerning the appropriate classification of students" (p. 481). Thus, testing is an integral part of the instructional program and it provides information which serves as a basis for a variety of educational decisions. The main emphasis in testing is on the extent to which educational goals are achieved. As the main purpose of teaching is to change behavior, the main purpose of testing is to improve learning and instruction.

Critics of testing frequently argue that achievement rather than individual development is being stressed by the testing programs of the school. It is important to extend our assessment of the school students beyond the conventional areas of aptitude and achievement. The measurement of numerous skills and abilities is the way to maximize learning and developmental activities for all pupils. For these reasons, it is essestial to know how teachers perceive the standardized school testing programs and what they actually want to see out of these standardized tests. Once we have these types of information, we can make recommendations to improve the existing standardized testing programs so that they maximize learning and development.

In general, criticisms of standardized tests can be categorized as relating to the nature of tests, the use of tests in educational settings, and the effects of testing on participants in the educational process. Probably the criticisms most frequently made of tests concern their nature. Critics claim that test constructors build their tests on the

assumptions that all students have a common culture and have had equal opportunity to learn while attending schools with a common curriculum. However, these assumptions have been challenged, and critics have argued that not all students share the middle-class culture that predominates in schools (Bartel, Grill, and Bryen, 1973; Herndon, 1975; Houts, 1975a; Quinto, 1977; Ryan, 1979). If testing practices reflect only the dominant culture's knowledge, language, and behavior, then they will provide imperfect measurement instruments for other groups (Tyler and White, 1979).

The use of tests in educational settings is also seen as creating many problems. Critics point out that since administrative procedures vary from one test site to another, the testing is not really standardized (Kellaghan, Madaus and Airasian, 1982). These writers further add that problems may also arise in the scoring, interpretation, and application of test results, thus making any judgments based on them of doubtful value. The application of test results is another aspect of testing that has attracted much critical comment. It is generally assumed that tests are widely used to select and classify students. While such procedures may not be carried out with the intention of "labeling" students, critics claim that this , in fact, is a common end result (Rist, 1977). Standardized test scores are often applied in rigid and arbitrary ways. In schools, this can result in assignment of children to ability groupings based on measures which may be indefensible. Particular problems are raised when pupils are mislabeled as, for example, when a student is classified as mentally retarded because he or she had problems with a test that is not in child's first language (Samuda, 1977).

A sampling of test-use literature reveals that most of the criticisms against standardized tests have been essays rather than research reports (Houts, 1977). Nonetheless, some excellent work has been done that was both objective and scientiffic. Kirkland (1971) reviewed the effects of tests on students and schools. More recently,

Rudman et al. (1980) provided a comprehensive literature review spanning almost 60 years and covering the linkage between assessment and teaching. Three major areas of review included: 1) use of test information for instructional decisions, 2) the link between testing and teaching, and 3) aids available in interpreting and using assessment information for instructional decision making.

A number of surveys have been reported concerning teacher and counsellor attitudes toward testing. Ebel (1969) noted that such surveys have generally shown support for the concept of standardized testing but considerable opposition to certain testing practices. Goslin (1967) reported a number of general conclusions about teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and uses of standardized tests. First, teachers tended to perceive the tests as fairly accurate measures of a student's intellectual ability and achievement. Second, teachers viewed the kind of abilities assessed by standardized tests as relevant determiners of pupils' future academic success and, to a smaller degree, of their success in life. Third, teachers reported that substantial weight should be accorded to standardized test scores-along with other indicators in making decisions about the selection and instruction of pupils. Fourth, teachers tended to believe that the kinds of abilities measured by standardized tests were more a result of learned than innate abilities. Fifth, teachers' opinions about whether pupils should be provided information about their test performance was divided, although all teachers felt that some children should be given information in some circumstances. Sixth, in spite of these attitudes and beliefs, teachers generally reported a low degree of use of test scores in grouping, planning instruction, and similar activities. Thus, Goslin's survey of testing at the elementary and secondary school level provides some evidence that teachers used test results primarily to diagnose individual difficulties and to provide information to the student. However, he also reported that the teachers did not rely heavily on this source of information.

The Royal Oak Study (Boyd, Mckenna, Stake & Yachinsky,1975) also supports the notion that teachers do not rely on required or published test results for instructional decision making. Although teachers reported variable use of results from the district-mandated testing program, there was little evidence that the testing program influenced school curriculum or classroom instruction. For the most part, teachers felt that normed standardized achievement tests were selected by administrators and imposed upon teachers, and they did not furnish any new information. They felt that test results supplied information about students' skills that were already well understood by teachers and parents. Although a small number of teachers thought test results, especially those from criterion-referenced tests, were useful; most felt that the tests given were not useful for planning instruction.

Stetz and Beck (1979) conducted a nationwide study of teachers' opinions of the use and usefulness of standardized tests, their study was conducted in conjunction with the standardization of the Metropolitan Achievement tests. In this study approximately 3,300 teachers responded to a questionnaire that elicited their views about the amount of standardized achievement testing in their schools and the usefulness of test information for various purposes, as well as information about their actual use of test results in the classroom. In the Stetz and Beck study, 80% of the teachers reported making only little use of test data, which is consistent with findings reported by Goslin (1967), and Boyd et al., (1975). Stetz and Beck concluded that both teachers and students feel tests are generally useful. Teachers don't depend on tests completely, but neither do they want to give more of them. Students viewed tests generally as fair.

In a national survey of elementary and secondary teachers who are members of the American Federation of Teachers, which was conducted by Jewell Gould and James Ward in October 1979, it was found that teachers attached great importance to the use of

standardized tests for the diagnosis of students' needs and for student placement and grouping. They indicated that they used tests less so for determining class needs and judging individual student progress. In the perception of teachers, standardized tests were least useful for modification of course content and evaluation of instructional programs.

In spite of this very positive attitude toward standardized tests, teachers identified a variety of factors which inhibited their use of these tests. Major inhibitors of standardized tests are:

. Test results do not provide enough prescriptive information (63 percent of survey respondents)

. Test results do not provide an adequate profile of student strengths and weaknesses (52 percent)

. Test results are returned too late to be useful, or are not returned to teachers (51 percent)

. Test content does not match the curriculum (47 percent)

. Test materials are inappropriate for students (46 percent)

Teachers want to use standardized tests, they do find them useful, but have identified areas for change which make them even more useful.

Several explanations support the premise that tests, while common elements in school operations, seem dysfunctional. At the most general level school personnel may be aware that the classroom instruction they provide has a relatively small influence on children's performance on standardized tests. They may therefore avoid the use of test results that are likely only to underscore and identify educational failures.

Another explanation may reflect the quality of the available instruments (Boyd, Mckenna, Stake & Yachinsky,1975). Some researchers reported that the quality of norm-referenced, standardized achievement tests as well as the newer, criterion-referenced

tests, was generally low (see Hoepfner, 1975; Walker, 1977). Further, tests might not be used because of the manner in which they report data. Scores are presented in a form convenient for decisions about groups rather than about individual learners; teachers' decisions, which focus in large part on the successes and failures of individual children, require a different kind of information (see Lortie, 1975).

Another factor contributing to limited use of tests may stem from teachers' understanding of the design, interpretation and use of tests for decision making (Cramer & Slakter, 1968). A final potential reason for the lack of test use may reside in contextual variables associated with individual schools. For instance, the number of instructional alternatives available in a school setting may influence the amount of testing required. Another contextual variable might reflect teachers' belief that test results provide minimal help in understanding the children in their classrooms.

However, the most frequently cited reasons for low reliance on available resources reflect criticisms of commercially available tests: lack of reliability and validity of both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests (Petrosko, 1978; Crew & Whitney,1978); cultural bias (Gardner, 1977, 1978); lack of match between test items and instructional content; lack of diagnostic information; cost for test purchase and student time; timeliness of testing and reporting.

The aforementioned studies present quite similar pictures of teacher perceptions regarding the usefulness of standardized testing for pupil centered purposes; teachers tend to perceive such testing as useful for the diagnosis of students' needs, and for student placement and grouping. Teachers want to use standardized tests, they do find them useful, but have identified areas for change which would make them even more useful. These surveys suggest that teachers are generally supportive of the idea of standardized tests, but are quite critical of the way the idea is being implemented in the

schools. For example, Gould and Ward (1980) reviewed the most recent criticisms aimed at standardized tests. They also presented survey data refuting opponents' claims. The survey of teacher knowledge and attitudes (Gould and Ward, 1980) concluded, among other things, that

> "Teachers seems to be supportive of standardized test ... (and) more significantly... want to improve standardized tests, not eliminate them."

In another survey, Olejinik (1979) presented data gathered from teachers, counsellors and principals regarding the advantages and limitations of achievement testing programs. Data indicated positive attitudes toward testing, but little use at the secondary school level. It appeared that educators were ill-prepared to interpret test scores, but were eager to learn.

Thus, it is clear that teachers generally seem positive in their attitude toward standardized testing. At the same time they are anxious to see improvements in standardized testting and assessment programs and instruments, as well as to learn about tests rather than abandon them.

As we know school testing programs involve the administration and utilization of the results of various types of standardized tests such as achievement, aptitude and intelligence tests and interest inventories. If school testing programs are intended to "help students learn better," those programs must measure some aspect of what is being learned (achievement) and what capacity exists for learning (academic aptitude). This study will focus on among other things the use of these two types of standardized tests: achievement and aptitude tests. Before proceeding further, it might be well to consider some basic similarities and differences between achievement tests and scholastic aptitude tests.

## ACHIEVEMENT AND SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TESTS

A common distinction is that achievement tests measure what a pupil has learned and scholastic aptitude tests measure his ability to learn new tasks. Actually, both types measure what a pupil has learned and both are useful for predicting his success in learning new tasks. As Gronlund (1981) states, the major differences lie in (1) the type of learning measured by each test, and (2) the type of prediction for which each is most useful.

Anastasi (1982) defines achievement tests as measuring the effects of relatively standardized sets of experiences such as knowledge of basic skills related to specific curriculum content. She further states "aptitude test performance reflects the cumulative influence of a multiplicity of experiences in daily living" and "serves to predict subsequent performance" (p. 393). In estimating the validity of these two types of tests, a very basic difference becomes apparent. Achievement test measures are usually evaluated in terms of their content validity, while predictive criterion-oriented validity is the most characteristic way of assessing aptitude tests.

Four important differences between aptitude and achievement tests are:

1. Scholastic aptitude tests sample more broadly.
2. Scholastic aptitude tests sample outside learning as well as school subjects. Acchievement tests focus on a particular academic curriculum.
3. Achievement tests sample more recent learning.
4. Scholastic aptitude tests predicts future performance, while the achievement tests seek to measure academic progress (Cleary et al., 1975, p. 21. as cited in Ahmann and Glock, 1981, p. 285).

Through an achievement test we may have an indication of what a child knows at present, while an aptitude test will tell us what his or her future performance may be like. However, warnings abound from numerous sources as to the dangers of applying these definitions too rigidly.

Gronlund (1981) further suggests that the types of learning measured by achievement and scholastic aptitude tests vary along a continuum. At one extreme is the content-oriented achievement test which measures knowledge of specific course ccontent, and at the other extreme is the culture-oriented scholastic aptitude test which measures behavior learned from the general culture and which is relatively free of school experiences. In between, and much closer together in terms of the types of learning measured, are the achievement test of general educational development and the school-oriented scholastic aptitude test. Both measure general abilities learned in school. However, the test of educational development measures a variety of intellectual skills and abilities pertaining to the major content areas taught in the school, while the school-oriented scholastic aptitude test measures intellectual skills in a more limited area, such as verbal and numerical reasoning (p. 231).

Thus, both achievement tests and scholastic aptitude tests measure learned abilities, but achievement tests measure those which are more directly dependent on specific school experiences while scholastic aptitude tests measure those of a more general nature.This is a matter of degree, however, with achievement and scholastic aptitude tests becoming very much alike in the area of general educational development. Achievement and scholastic aptitude tests are also similar in that they are both useful in predicting future achievement. Generally then, both tests measure aspects of achievement and can be used as predictors of future success. For example, "If a student does well on an arithmetic achievement test, the score is a good predictor of performance in algebra or

geometry" (Ahmann & Glock, 1981, p. 284). Furthermore, aptitude tests "are very similar to achievement tests because they measure knowledge and skills that require direct training" (p. 285).

While it is important to recognize the similarities of aptitude and achievement tests, it is essential that the functions of the two not be confused. Achievement tests focus on specific curriculum content related to what the student is in the process of learning. The results can be used in the classroom to evaluate the students weaknesses and strengths at the end of a training period, then plan a program to meet the needs indicated. Aptitude tests are used to predict future performance. They can be used to help the student to plan for future high school and post secondary courses. Applications of the test results for these two types of tests must be utilized in the appropriate context. For example, achievement test score results, if used effectively can supplement what is already known about the student (Goldman, 1969). With this increased knowledge, decision making can be enhanced to determine if further assessment such as diagnostic tests need to be implemented. This may then result in decisions being made regarding specialized placements, individualized or remedial instruction (Ebel, 1979).

Since achievement tests are the most commonly used tests in education, it is important to understand at least two different ways these tests are used to make comparisons of students.First, we can see how well a student did on an achievement test compared to similar students from across the country. A test that yields this kind of information is called a norm-referenced test (NRT) because the information it conveys refers to the performance of a large sample of pupils representative of those we are testing. Secondly, we can also compare how well a student did on an achievement test by comparing his or her performance to predetermined criteria. A test that yields this kind of information is called a criterion-referenced test (CRT) because the information it conveys

refers to a comparison with a criterion or absolute standard. Such information helps us decide whether a student needs more or less work on some skills or set of skills.

Thus, there are two basic kinds of achievement tests: norm-referenced tests and criterion-referenced tests. The difference between these tests is how they evaluate a student's performance. The first type of test (NRT) allows a school to see how well its students or programs are doing compared with similar students or programs across the country. The second type of test (CRT) compares the student to a set of criteria or expectations in terms of skills to be mastered. In many ways criterion-referenced tests, like diagnostic tests, allow the teacher to see which skills have been mastered and which have not and to plan specific educational programs for the student.

In addition to the way of interpreting student performance on tests, standardized achievement tests may also be classified as diagnostic, single-subject and survey batteries. These three different kinds of standardized achievement tests need to be considered here very briefly. Diagnostic tests are designed to isolate a pupil's specific strengths and weaknesses in some particular field of knowledge. For example, an achievement test in arithmetic computation may simply show that the student is performing poorly in that general area. A diagnostic arithmetic test might show that the student can do everything but carry and borrow in addition and subtraction problems. For the most part, diagnostic tests are the most popular test tool used by teachers and educational specialists. These tests allow teachers to identify the specific strengths and weaknesses a student has and then plan a precise program to overcome those weaknesses.

Single-subject-matter achievement tests, are concerned with measuring the pupil's educational accomplishments in a single content area; and survey batteries, which consist of a group of tests in different content areas standardized on the same population so that the results of the various components may be meaningfully compared.

The most frequently used type of achievement test is the achievement test battery, or survey battery. Such batteries are widely used, often beginning in the first grade and administered each year thereafter. There are several reasons survey batteries are more popular than single-subject achievement tests. One major advantage of survey batteries over single-subject achievement tests is each subtest is normed on the same sample, making comparisons across subtests, both within and between individuals, easier and more valid. This is probably the major reason batteries have come into such widespread use.

In summary, standardized tests do have an effect on the schools, influencing both the curriculum and teaching methods. This influence is generally considered a positive force by teachers and administrators. Helping the student is considered the central purpose of standardized testing. Standardized testing has been and probably will continue to be a very integral part of the educational process. It is, therefore, important for us those who are closely working with school testing programs to become more familiar with the beliefs, attitudes and opinions teachers hold about standardized achievement and aptitude testing programs and how they use such tests in their classrooms. Standardized tests are a tool that can help teachers improve educational programs for students. Unless they are used wisely, they can easily distort the overall picture of a child's educational development.

This chapter summarizes the major criticisms pertaining to standardized educational testing and the available surveys concerning teacher attitudes toward standardized school testing programs to provide a picture of how teachers feel about and use standardized tests in their schools. While research has been conducted in the area of attitudes toward standardized testing, respondents have been primarily in the U.S.A. To date in Alberta, teachers' attitudes toward standardized achievement and aptitude testing have not been systematically explored across the entire grade K-12 range.

With these points in mind, the purpose of this study are to explore: (1) teachers' sentiments regarding the amount of standardized testing in their school systems, (2) their uses of standardized achievement and aptitude tests results in their schools, and (3) their opinions concerning the usefulness of standardized test results for various purposes.

In connection with the above purposes, teachers were questioned about their attitudes toward the amount of standardized testing in their school-system, their personal use of the results of such instruments,their opinions with respect to the usefulness of some pre-selected achievement and aptitude tests and their general reactions to such tests.

## Chapter-3

## METHODOLOGY

**The Study:** The author under the supervision of Dr. R. Mulcahy, Professor and Director of Learning and Motor Development Clinic, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, planned and executed a survey to gather more objective data concerning the attitudes of school teachers toward the use of some specifically named standardized achievement and aptitude tests in their classrooms. It was conducted in between March and April of 1986. Its main purpose was to measure elementary to high school teachers' attitudes toward these achievement and aptitude testing programs of their school districts; and to explore what they wanted to obtain from standardized testing programs.

**Survey Instrument:** Two seperate questionnaires were developed to elicit responses from teachers. In general the questions concerned: 1) familiarity with and understanding the meaning of the results from specified standardized tests; 2) availability of the tests to those administering them in the school; 3) sources of learning about the tests; 4) current use of the tests in the school; 5) the best person(s) to contact to learn more about the standardized tests; 6) opinions about the accuracy, fairness, and usefulness of standardized tests; 7) their opinions on extending the use of "student profile card" to high school level; 8) their views of the usefulness of standardized tests in discussing a student's achievement; 9) areas that would like to see assessed with standardized tests; 10) the form in which they would prefer to have the information from standardized tests provided; 11) their preferences about how to use standardized test information.

The questionnaires were pilot tested in three schools (elementary, junior high and high school) and they can be considered as valid and reliable instruments to examine the teachers' opinions concerning the current use and possible future use of standardized tests within the urban school system of the province of Alberta. The mechanics of

questionnaires design, phrasing and comprehensiveness were all considered very carefully to elicit the responses of school personnel.

**Sample and Procedures:** Using random sample tables, 350 elementary to high school teachers were selected from the urban school system of Alberta. Age or sex was not used to stratify the sample, which was obtained by volunteer participation through a written request for subjects. Teachers were instructed to answer the survey questions based on their knowledge about the specifically named standardized tests in this survey as well as their attitudes toward and opinions about standardized tests in general.

Materials sent to each member of the sample consisted of an introductory letter, a questionnaire, and a postpaid return envelope. The introductory letter stated the purpose of the questionnaire and stressed the importance of assisting with the study. Approximately two weeks later, a follow-up letter was sent to each member of the sample, reminding them of the due date and the importance of the study. All respondents were offered a free copy of the final report of this survey.

**Data Analysis:** Results were analysed for the total sample and grade-level grouped as K-3, 4-6, 7-9 and 10-12. Percentage and the actual numbers of respondents are presented in the tabulated data. The standard error of measurement was also calculated for are included in the data.

# Chapter-4

## RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter summarizes data gathered from the Alberta urban school teachers of elementary, junior high and high school levels. The data presented in the following pages are concerned primarily with describing and analyzing those aspects of the teacher role having to do with testing. The chapter provides data concerning the use of tests in the urban schools generally: how many tests are given; what kinds, when, and for what purposes. It also provides information on teacher attitudes toward, and opinions about, standardized tests, including whether they think tests are accurate, fair, and useful for various purposes. Thus, in the study we collected information that would examine the use of tests in the urban school system of Alberta and the perceptions and attitudes of teachers concerning standardized achievement and aptitude tests. The tables that follow present the responses to items in the two separate teacher questionnaires. These tables are presented in the order of the questions on the questionnaires, and the responses are separated according to grade-level (i.e. K-3, 4-6, 7-9 and 10-12 grades).

### ELEMENTARY TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

By the cut-off date, 203 elementary and junior high school teacher (k-3, 4-6 & 7-9 grades) questionnaires were returned which constituted a 74% response rate for teachers in these grade-levels. Data in columns 2 and 3 of Table 1 (Appendix - A) summarize the number and percent of teachers responding to the questionnaire. Tables 2 to 29 (Appendix A) summarize the respondents opinions concerning the current use and possible future use of standardized tests within the urban school system of the province of Alberta.

**Table-I**

**Total Number of Teachers Responding**

| Total No. of Questionnaires Sent | No. of Teachers Responded | Percent of Teachers Responded |
|---|---|---|
| 275 | 203 | 74 |

*Teacher opinions about the student profile cards*

In making inferences about a student, it is usually desirable to consider several sources of information. Some testing procedures involve a battery of tests, several different tests measuring some what different characteristics. Multiple scores from one or several tests are often presented graphically to illustrate the examinee's profile of performance, which is usually expressed as percentile or standard scores. For example, Metropolitan Achievement tests has sections on reading, mathematics, language, science, and social studies as well as totals based on the basic battery (the first three sections) and all five sections. Thus, a student's profile consists of his or her relative standing on six scores. The student profile card is, therefore, a graphic representation of test scores and such a graphic representation of test data makes it easy for teacher to identify a pupil's relative strengths and weaknesses. Profile analysis is an appraisal of the individual in which his or her pattern of abilities or personality traits is reported in relation to a set of norms or standards.

Table 2 (Appendix A) summarizes teachers' responses to question "I am familiar with the purpose of the "Student Profile Cards"." Overall, majority of the respondents are familiar with the purpose of the "Student Profile Cards" and 75 to 83 percent of respondents believed that "Student Profile Cards" provide information in terms of : student's intelligence, student's reading achievement and student's arithmetic achievement (See Table 3 in Appendix A ).

Table 11 (Appendix A) summarizes the respondents' opinions of the usefulness of "student profile card" for five different purposes. Results of this item of the questionnaire indicate that a majority of teachers considered "student profile card" useful on occasion for "deciding what level to begin teaching reading and /or math with a child", "indicating accurately the child's progress from year to year", "deciding whether a child should repeat a grade" and "special program placement decisions", while majority of the respondents rated the student profile card as very useful for providing information regarding the student's potential to achieve (ability). Overall, a large portion of total number of respondents rated the student profile card either useful or very useful for the aforementioned purposes, while only a small percent of teachers did not consider it useful for the purposes listed in Table 11.

Those surveyed were also asked to indicate their use of the four aspects as listed in Table 17 (Appendix A) of the "Student Profile Card". As shown in Table 17, a large percent of teachers indicated the use of "Student's intelligence (ability)", "Student's reading achievement" and "Student's arithmetic achievement" of the student profile card "sometimes", but "never" used the "Demographic characteristics". At the same time, a considerable percentage of teachers suggested their use of "Student's intelligence (ability)", "Student's reading achievement" and "Student's arithmetic achievement" either "Frequently" or "Never". In addition or instead of the standardized tests given at the school, teachers were asked whether they would also like to see other subject areas or other test results assessed or included on the student profile cards. The greatest percent answered negatively or were not sure. Only a very small percent of total number of teachers wanted to see other subject areas or other test results assessed and included on the student profile cards.

Responses to the question, "I find the information on the student profile card very helpful when discussing a child's level of functioning with parents" were spread across three response options: "Yes"; "No"; "Only on occasion". As Table 23 (Appendix A) shows, 56 percent of teachers considered such profile card helpful "only on occasion", while between 20 and 22 percent of respondents considered such profile card either helpful or very helpful when discussing a child's level of functioning with parents.

Teachers were also asked their opinions of helpfulness of the student profile card when making classroom placement decisions. Results are summarized in Table 24 (Appendix A). As can be seen in the Table 24, 57 percent of teachers found the information on the student profile card helpful when making classroom placement decisions. At the same time 26 percent suggested that this was not applicable in their case and only 13 percent answered negatively. These results suggest that the information on the student profile card is important for teachers and can be used for various academic purposes.

*Teachers' Knowledge and Familiarity with the Standardized Tests*

Table 4 (Appendix A) summarizes teachers' responses to the question "I am familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from the following standardized tests. "The obtained results show that majority of the respondents feel they are familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from Lorge-Thorndike, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills and WISC-R. At the same time, a small percent of respondents indicated that standardized tests, such as Key Math, Peabody, Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test, Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test and S.T.E.P., as well as meaning of the results of these tests, were known to them.

**Table-II**

**Teachers ' Knowledge and Familiarity With the Standardized Tests Results**

| TOTAL | L-T | GMRT | CTBS | KM | WISC-R | PMA | SAT | PEABO |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 129 | 136 | 175 | 9 | 108 | 97 | 43 | 30 |
| PERCENT | 64 | 67 | 86 | 4 | 53 | 48 | 21 | 15 |
| TOTAL | WRAT-R | MAT | OLMAT | STEP | | | | |
| NUMBER | 31 | 31 | 32 | 27 | | | | |
| PERCENT | 15 | 15 | 16 | 13 | | | | |

Respondents were also asked whether they would be able to obtain the following tests to administer in their schools. About 39 to 76 percent of teachers mentioned that if they requested it, they would be able to obtain the Lorge-Thorndike, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R and P.M.A. On this question, only 4 to 19 percent of total number of teachers said Key Math, Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Peabody, Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), Metropolitan Achievement Test, Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test as well as S.T.E.P. were available in their districts. The obtained results show that teachers are less acquainted with these tests, and use only few familiar tests (i.e. Lorge-Thorndike, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R etc.) when considering standardized testing.

**Table-III**

**Availability of Tests to Administer in the School**

| TOTAL | L-T | GMRT | CTBS | KM | WISC-R | PMA | SAT | PEAB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 115 | 139 | 155 | 9 | 84 | 79 | 30 | 14 |
| PERCENT | 57 | 68 | 76 | 4 | 41 | 39 | 15 | 7 |
| TOTAL | WRAT-R | MAT | OLMAT | STEP | | | | |
| NUMBER | 20 | 34 | 38 | 27 | | | | |
| PERCENT | 10 | 17 | 19 | 13 | | | | |

*Opinions Concerning the Source of Learning About the Tests*

The next question surveyed teacher opinions concerning the source of information about the tests. Respondents were asked to respond to ten possible sources about

the standardized tests. At the same time, teachers were also asked to indicate any other sources. Table 6 (Appendix A) summarizes the results. As can be seen in the table, the most important sources of information were "other teachers", "my principal", "school psychologist" "my university training", and "school counsellor". The greatest percent of teachers indicated that they learned about the tests from their colleagues, principals and their university training.

A further question concerned teachers' interests in learning more about the standardized tests available. Table 9 (Appendix A) summarizes responses to 7 sources from where teachers can learn more about tests and other assessment methods that contribute to the improvement of instruction. A majority of teachers indicated that they learned more about the standardized tests available from the school psychologist. The

school psychologist is the consultant to the teacher and he/she may determine testing policy for school districts, as well as continuing the more traditional practices of testing, diagnosis, and intervention.

**Table-IV**

**Sources From Where Teachers Can Learn More About the Tests**

| TOTAL | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 52 | 12 | 44 | 38 | 19 | 37 | 8 |
| PERCENT | 26 | 6 | 22 | 19 | 9 | 18 | 4 |

Key: A. the school psychologist B. other teachers C. the consultant in the area that I was interested in assessing D. my principal E. school district testing coordinator F. school counsellor G. there is no one who could provide me with much information and so I would have to find out from a variety of sources on my own.

Thus, when teachers want to know about the tests they first go to the school psychologist. Other than this source, a high percentage (18-22%) of respondents checked or listed the "assessment consultant, school principal as well as school counsellor" as their second important sources of learning about the tests. However, as shown in Table 10 (Appendix A),73 percent of teachers felt that they were interested in knowing more about the standardized tests available, while, only 22 percent suggested that this was not applicable in their case.

*The Current Uses of Standardized Testing*

One of the questions asked about the current uses of standardized testing that takes place in the teachers' own school system. Table 8 (Appendix A) summarizes the results. From 38 to 92 percent of respondents indicated that tests like Lorge-Thorndike,

Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R and P.M.A. were being used in their own school system. Another 2 to 19 percent of total teachers who participated in the present survey indicated the use of Key Math, Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Peabody, Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), Metropolitan Achievement Test, Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test and S.T.E.P. in their districts. It seems, in part, that majority of teachers use a very few standardized tests (i.e. Lorge - Thorndike , Gates

**Table-V**

**Current Uses of Standardized Tests in the School**

| TOTAL | L-T | GMRT | CTBS | K-M | WISC-R | PMA | SAT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 133 | 110 | 187 | 4 | 78 | 109 | 15 |
| PERCENT | 66 | 54 | 92 | 2 | 38 | 54 | 7 |
| TOTAL | PEAB. | WRAT-R | MAT | OLMAT | STEP | | |
| NUMBER | 7 | 11 | 23 | 27 | 39 | | |
| PERCENT | 3 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 19 | | |

MacGinitie Reading Test and Canadian Test of Basic Skills etc.) at the elementary and junior high school level.

In terms of standardized tests in the urban elementary and junior high school level, 20 percent of total number of respondents indicate that there are only a few (2-3) standardized tests that they are allowed to use in their classrooms. At the same time, 22 percent of teachers participated in the present survey suggest that there are many standardized tests available which are relatively easy to obtain. However, the greater

proportion (35 percent) of respondents were unsure about the practices for standardized tests in the urban elementary and junior high schools of Alberta.

*Important Uses of Standardized Test Results*

Table 16 (Appendix A) summarizes the responses of teachers to concerns about the important uses for standardized tests (See Table-VI For a Summary). Results of this question indicate that teachers ranked "individual student program planning" as the most important usage of standardized tests which is followed by "administrative data and program evaluation". "Teacher evaluation" has been ranked least important.

**Table-VI**

**Important Uses of Standardized Test Results**

| | TEACHER EVALUATION | | | | PROGRAM EVALUATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RANK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| NUMBER | 7 | 22 | 57 | 92 | 32 | 91 | 47 | 10 |
| PERCENT | 3 | 11 | 28 | 45 | 16 | 45 | 23 | 5 |
| | ADMINISTRATIVE DATA | | | | IND. ST. PRO. PLANNING | | | |
| RANK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| NUMBER | 53 | 29 | 46 | 52 | 87 | 41 | 26 | 27 |
| PERCENT | 26 | 14 | 23 | 26 | 43 | 20 | 13 | 13 |

*Advantage or disadvantage of standardized tests*

Teachers were also asked to indicate whether or not all of the standardized tests given in their system provide information on item analysis. As shown in Table 13 (Appendix A) a considerable percent of teacher respondents answered positively, while 51 percent (n=104) of participants reported that they were unsure. Another question asked about test information provided to the school, whether teachers could determine how their grade performed compared to all the children at that same grade level in their system. The greatest percent of teacher respondents answered affirmatively, while 22 percent of teachers

reported that they were not sure about their opinions. However, with respect to this

**Table-VII**

**Uses of Test Information to Compare Students' Performance in the System**

| TOTAL | YES | NO | DON'T KNOW |
|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 132 | 20 | 44 |
| PERCENT | 65 | 10 | 22 |

question, 73 percent of total number of teachers participated in this survey indicated that they found this would be more of an advantage of standardized tests. While only a very small percent (14 percent) of teachers suggested that they did not find this an advantage of standardized tests. These results indicate that with the help of standardized tests results teachers are in a position to compare their grade performance with all the children at that same grade level in the system. Thus, in their opinions it is more advantageous to use standardized tests. A summary of these results can be seen in the table-VIII.

**Table-VII**

**Advantage or Disadvantage of Standardized Tests**

| TOTAL | ADVANTAGE | DISADVANTAGE |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 148 | 28 |
| PERCENT | 73 | 14 |

*Opinions Concerning the assesibility of standardized tests*

As can be seen in Table 19 (Appendix A) a majority of teachers found that students' grade level achievement in the classroom was approximately the same as that attained on standardized achievement tests, while only a small percent of teachers either found "lower than" or "higher than" that attained on standardized achievement tests. Table 20 (Appendix A) summarizes teachers' responses to the question, "Generally speaking, the standardized tests assess similar content to that which I teach in the classroom". Overall, 36 percent of the respondents answered "Yes" and 37 percent answered "No". Only 18 percent of teachers reported that they were not sure whether or not the standardized tests assess similar content to that which they teach in their classrooms.

*Opinions Concerning the Best Use of the Intelligence Tests Results*

In addition to perception about the standardized tests, the use of intelligence tests results in the classroom would also seem to depend, at least to some degree, on what teachers believe the test measure. To obtain information about the best use of the results from the group intelligence tests, teachers were asked to give their opinions and their responses to five options. Results are presented in Table 21(Appendix A). Between 21 and 30 percent of teachers thought the results from the group intelligence tests are best used to "supply a valid and reliable estimate of the child's learning potential", "make

placement decisions concerning special programs" and "screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much higher than their achievement".

**Table-IX**

**Best Use of the Results From the Group Intelligence Tests**

| TOTAL | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 60 | 47 | 42 | 22 | 22 |
| PERCENT | 30 | 23 | 21 | 11 | 11 |

Key: A. supply a valid and reliable estimate of the child's learning potential, B. make placement decisions concerning special programs, C. screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much higher than their achievement, D. screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much lower than their achievement, E. unsure.

Only 11 percent of teacher respondents checked that IQ tests results are best used to "screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much lower than their achievement", and another 11 percent mentioned that they were unsure about their opinions.

*Teacher Preferences to have the Standardized Tests Information*

Teachers also completed another item of the questionnaire that asked for their opinions about how they would prefer to have the standardized test results provided to them. Data in the Table 25 (Appendix A) indicate that the majority of teachers in all grades prefered to have the standardized test results provided to them more extensively than given in final scores (so that results might be more helpful diagnostically). Across grades, 28

to 46 percent of teachers prefer "as it is currently". While, only 2 percent of teachers indicated that they would like to see "other" ways.

Teachers were also asked to say how they would like the test results reported on the profile card. The teachers could respond "percentiles"; "grade equivalents"; "standard scores"; "raw scores" or "other". Respondents were requested to rank each response option from 1 to 4 in order of preference; where 1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred. Responses are reported in Table 26 (Appendix A). Data in this table indicate that the majority of teachers in all grades considered "percentiles" and "grade equivalents" as their most preferred forms, while the majority of teachers ranked "standard scores" as well as "raw scores" as the least preferred methods. Only a small number of teachers indicated that they would prefer to get the information in the form of "standard scores" or "raw scores".

*Teacher Opinions Concerning the Standardized Testing Procedures*

As shown in Table 27 (Appendix A) the greatest percent (73%) of teachers participated in the present survey felt that standardized testing procedures in their schools were beneficial, and only a very small percent of teachers (18%) did not feel that way. A

**Table-X**

**Standardized Testing Procedures are a Beneficial Asset**

| TOTAL | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 149 | 36 |
| PERCENT | 73 | 18 |

further question concerned teachers' opinions about abolishing standardized tests, and their responses are presented in Table 28 (Appendix A). Overall, 70 percent of teachers do not

**Table-XI**

**Opinions About Abolishing StandardizedTests**

| TOTAL | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| NUMBER | 44 | 142 |
| PERCENT | 22 | 70 |

feel that there is too much emphasis placed on standardized test results, and would not like to see them abolished. At the same time, only 22 percent of respondents feel that school is placing too much emphasis on standardized test results, and this practice should be abolished. Finally, in the survey teachers were asked to give their opinions about any change they think necessary to improve the existing standardized testing program. As can be seen in Table 29 (Appendix A), 58 percent (n=118) of teachers thought that the idea of standardized testing was a good one, but they would like to see some changes in order to increase the effectiveness. Only 32 percent (n=65) of teachers did not want to see any change in the present standardized school testing program.

**SUMMARY: ELMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS**

The study was concerned with the impact of standardized testing and test information on teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and practices. The data presented in the previous pages provide information on teachers attitudes toward, and opinions about, standardized tests, including whether teachers think tests are accurate, fair, and useful for various purposes. To summarize the results of this section, teachers expressed positive attitudes toward the standardized tests used in the study. They liked the tests and

perceived some advantageous outcomes as issuing from their use. Teachers are familiar with a variety of specifically named standardized tests and administer some of these tests in making decisions about pupils. Teachers are interested in learning more about the standardized tests available and they believe that standardized tests are generally accurate and useful. They see the kind of abilities measured by standardized tests as important determinants of the subsequent academic success of children and these tests are useful for program evaluation and individual student program planning. In their opinion, considerable weight should be given to test scores, along with the "student profile card" in making decisions about pupils. Teachers also feel that standardized testing procedures in the schools are a beneficial asset as they currently exist but could be more effective if some changes were made.

It is clear from the results of the survey that teachers use standardized test results to help make decisions about individual students relating to diagnosis of needs, grouping, and placement, but that teachers recognize the limitations of such tests for these purposes. There seems to be a clearly perceived need for more and better information about students and a desire to improve standardized tests to provide that information. To improve tests is to improve education. In order to improve the existing standardized school testing program, we also collected information that would allow us to examine the effects of standardized testing on the perception and attitudes of high school teachers.

**HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES**

By the cut-off date all 75 high school teacher questionnaires had been returned. Tables 30 to 40 in Appendix B summarize the respondents opinions concerning the current use and possible future use of standardized tests within the urban high school system of the province of Alberta.

*Familiarity With and Understanding the Meaning of the Standardized Tests Results*

Table 30 summarizes responses to the question "I am familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from the following standardized tests." Overall, majority of the respondents felt they were familiar with and understood the meaning of the results from Lorge-Thorndike, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R and Stanford Achievement Test. However, only a small percentage (4-17) of respondents indicated that standardized tests such as Key Math, P.M.A., Peabody, Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), Metropolitan Achievement Test, Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test and S.T.E.P. as well as meaning of the results of these tests were known to them.

*High School Teachers' Access to Standardized Tests*

Respondents were also asked whether they would be able to obtain the following tests to administer in their schools. Seven to 15 % of high school teachers said that if they requested it, they would be able to obtain the Lorge-Thorndike, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT). Only a very few teachers (1 to 5%) had access to Key Math, P.M.A., Peabody, Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), Metropolitan Achievement Test, Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test as well as S.T.E.P.

*Teachers' Opinions Concerning the Sources of Learning About the Tests*

The next question surveyed high school teacher opinions about how they learned about the tests. Respondents were asked to respond to eight possible sources, as well as being given the opportunity to describe any other source. Table 32 (Appendix B)

summarizes the results. The most important sources were "Other teachers", "Special Education Consultant", "Remedial Reading Consultant", "School Psychologist" and "My University Training". The larger majority (28%) felt they learned about the tests from their university training.

*The Current Uses of Standardized Tests In The High School*

One of the questionnaire items asked about the current uses of standardized testing in the teachers' own school system. Table 33 in Appendix B summarizes the results. Only 3 to 7 percent of the responses indicated that tests like Lorge-Thorndike, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, WISC-R and Stanford Achievement Test were being used. The above results suggest very little use of standardized tests at the high school level to make educational decisions.

*Teachers' Interests In Learning About The Standardized Tests*

A further question concerned teachers' interests in learning more about the standardized tests available. Table 34 (Appendix B) summarizes responses to 6 sources from which teachers can learn more about tests and other assessment methods that contribute to the improvement of instruction. A majority of teachers indicated that they learned more about standardized tests from the school psychologist. Other than this source of learning, a considerable number of respondents (8-11%) checked or listed the "assessment consultant,school principal as well as school testing coordinator" as their second important sources of learning about the tests. As shown in Table 35, 51 percent of high school teachers felt that they were interested in knowing more about the standardized tests available, while, only 19 percent suggested they were not.

*The Extention of Student Profile Card to High Schools*

Results from the ability (intelligence) test and yearly standardized achievement tests are reported as percentiles and grade equivalents on a "student profile card". Teachers in the survey were asked to indicate whether or not they want to see this procedure extended to Senior High Schools. The obtained results show that 36 percent of teachers wanted to see this procedure extended to the Senior High level, while, 13 percent responded negatively and 25 percent were not sure (See Table 36 in Appendix B).

*Opinions Concerning The Usefulness of Standardized Tests*

Table 37 (Appendix B) summarizes the respondents' opinions of the usefulness of standardized tests in discussing a student's achievement with the students and/or their parents. Results indicate that a majority of teachers considered such tests useful for discussing educational achievement of individual students. Only 11 percent of teachers considered such tests not useful for this purpose, while 11 teachers were unsure.

*Areas Assessed With Standardized Tests*

Those surveyed were also asked to indicate which of the four areas as listed in Table 38 that they would like to see assessed with standardized tests. As shown in Table 38 (Appendix B), a majority of teachers felt that "student's intelligence (ability)", "student's language arts skills" and "student's mathematics" were the most important areas, followed by "other subject areas". Only 3 percent of teachers indicated that they would like to see "other subject areas" assessed with standardized tests.

*Preferences To Have The Standardized Tests Information*

In this survey, respondents were also asked in what time of the year they would prefer to have the information from yearly standardized achievement testing given to them. A large percent of respondents indicated that September would be the best time of the year. A few other respondents also indicated March, June, October, November and December. Teachers were also requested to indicate in what form they would like the information provided. As shown in Table 39, majority of the respondents considered "grade scores", "national percentiles", "local percentiles" as well as "item analyses" as the prefered forms. Only a small number of teachers wanted information about standardized achievement tests in the form of raw scores.

*Opinions Concerning The Uses of Standardized Test Results*

Finally, the questionnaire listed six possible uses of standardized test results. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they personally used tests for these purposes, and to indicate any other uses they made of such data. Table 40 summarizes the percent as well as number of teachers who indicated they used standardized tests for the six listed purposes. The most frequent uses checked were for "providing information on child's potential to achieve (ability)", "screening for possible special education placement", "instructional planning" and "reporting to parents".

**SUMMARY: HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS**

In summary, the results of the survey seem to indicate that in general teachers across the elementary, middle and high school levels view standardized tests positively. They perceived standardized intelligence and achievement tests as accurate measures of a pupil's scholastic ability. Teachers seem to be generally supportive of the use of

standardized tests. They understand the need for quality standards in education, and they want more useful information about their students. Teachers find tests to be useful, but they personally use the results only to some degree. They find the uses for which test data are employed to be generally appropriate. They are supportive of tests, but mostly when used for instruction-related purposes. Teachers find tests most useful for the purposes with which they are primarily concerned - instructional planning for individuals and groups and providing information on child's potential to acvhieve. Overall, we can conclude that teachers in all groups generally view standardized tests as one component of the ongoing instructional program. Teachers would like to see yearly standardized achievement and aptitude testing carried out at the elementary, junior high and high school levels.

## Chapter-5

# GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Teachers play a central role in most school testing programs. In this study we have tried to present as complete and detailed a picture of teacher involvement in standardized testing as the survey data permit. Urban elementary, junior high and high school teachers responded to a variety of questions concerned with: (1) familiarity with and understanding the meaning of the results from some standardized tests; (2) availability of the tests to those administering them in the school; (3) opinions about the accuracy, fairness, and usefulness of standardized tests; (4) actual uses of tests, including reporting of scores to pupils and parents; (5) sources of learning about the tests; (6) the best person(s) to contact to learn more about the standardized tests; (7) their opinions on extending the use of "student profile card" to high school level; (8) areas that would like to see assessed with standardized tests; (9) form they would prefer to have the information from standardized tests provided to them; (10) their preference to use standardized test information made available to them.

In this study we were concerned with the opinions and attitudes of teachers from K-12 grades regarding standardized tests of achievement and aptitude. This chapter provides a general discussion about the effects that testing and the provision of test information had on teachers' attitudes toward and beliefs about standardized tests. We elicited teachers' perceptions of the accuracy of standardized tests, the constructs measured by intelligence tests, and the relevance and effects of standardized testing; we also asked them to express opinions about the uses of test information and to indicate their attitudes toward general educational issues.

The data presented in chapter 4 provide an overall picture of teacher attitudes toward and beliefs about standardized tests and the qualities they measure. Teachers who

express confidence in the accuracy of standardized tests also feel that they measure the qualities necessary for success in future academic and nonacademic pursuits. Further, they feel that considerable weight should be given to test scores in making decisions about pupils. To the extent that we provide teachers with more and better training in the theory and practice of testing, the more teachers are likely to hold opinions about tests that are consistent and positive. The overall confidence in tests expressed by teachers supports the contention that the part played by teachers in the testing process is an important one. Teachers not only have ready access to test scores and frequently take part in the administration and scoring of tests; they also tend to view the results of tests as accurately reflecting important qualities of the pupils tested. Whether a teacher views tested intelligence as being primarily learned or innate is likely to be an important influence on the way that teacher reacts to reports of the performance of his pupils on a standardized test.

In general, it appears that the teachers in the district surveyed have a positive attitude toward the standardized aptitude and achievement testing program. These results seem consistent across the school levels: elementary, junior high and high. A large proportion of teachers participated in this survey are familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from a variety of specifically named standardized tests. Teachers also have experience in administering and scoring these standardized tests in their classes, and the major rationale for administering them is that the results provide teachers with information that helps them evaluate their pupils more accurately and guides their instructional decisions. The extent to which test results are used for these and other purposes should, it seems, be a function of teachers' perceptions of the accuracy of the information provided by the tests.

Teachers find the uses for which test data are employed to be appropriate...generally. They do not feel there is too much testing in their schools. They do

not want to eliminate standardized tests, but they do not want more testing. Teachers find tests most useful for the purposes with which they are primarily concerned-instructional planning for individuals and groups as well as program evaluation. They attach great importance to the use of standardized tests for the diagnosis of students' needs and for student placement and grouping.

Teachers are interested in maintaining quality standards in schools, and view standardized testing as one method of doing that. Teachers want to use standardized tests, they do find them useful, and are interested in some changes which would make standardized tests even more useful. The vast majority characterized themselves as moderately or very comfortable with, interested in, knowledgeable about, and supportive toward standardized testing. In general, teachers tend to view standardized test results as most useful for pupil-centered purposes; they tend to perceive such testing as useful for assessing individual and group status, for reporting to parents, and for planning instruction. At the same time, teachers in the survey tend to view such tests results as least useful for activities assocciated with teacher accountability. Interestingly, the teachers' negative attitudes toward the increased use of test results for accountability decisions did not lead them to view tests in general or all test uses as harmful or bad.

Similar surveys and studies have been conducted lately using different groups and instruments. These studies come after a decade which had seen a steady attack on tests and declining scores. The conclusions reached are similar to the present study. One such study, by Beck and Stetz (1979) of the Psychological Corporation, surveyed a national sample of 3300 K-12 teachers about various standardized achievement test issues. They found the same generally positive attitudes toward most typical uses of standardized achievement tests that this survey found. Beck and Stetz concluded that both teachers and

students feel tests are generally useful. Teachers don't depend on tests completely, but neither do they want to give more of them. Students viewed tests generally as fair.

Teachers themselves report that they regard standardized test results as important. In a national survey of elementary school teachers in the USA carried out by Austin and Morrison (1963), 80 percent of teachers reported that they "always" or "often" used reading-readiness test scores in determining placement in a first-grade reading program. However, more direct evidence on the influence of test information on teachers' perceptions is not as compelling as this statistic on reported teacher use. The majority of teachers in this survey feel that standardized testing procedures in their schools are a beneficial asset as they currently exist and they see more advantages of standardized tests rather than disadvantages.

In addition to perceptions about the accuracy of the information provided by standardized tests, the use of test results in the classroom would also seem to depend, at least to some degree, on what teachers believe the tests measure. Regardless of how accurate test information may be perceived to be, if the constructs underlying the tests are considered to be irrelevant or unimportant to classroom instruction or to the tasks of the school, the tests are unlikely to have a significant impact on practice. Many of the teachers in the present survey may feel that the constructs underlying the standardized tests are relevant and important to measure the educational growth of individuals, detect systemwide general strengths or weaknesses, help plan instruction for class groups, report to parents, help plan instruction for individuals, measure the educational status of individuals and screen special education students.

Teachers frequently use test scores to make predictions. Teachers' knowledge of and training in test administration and interpretation greatly influence how frequently teachers make use of test data. Generally speaking, teachers who have more

training in tests and measurement are, in fact, more likely to make use of results from required tests. Teachers in our survey indicate that they learn more about the standardized tests available from the school psychologist, assessment consultant, school principal as well as school counsellor. Teachers also express their interest in knowing more about the tests but we did not take into account background charactertistics of teachers as related to their having taken testing courses or any formal training in measurement techniques. Since, teachers have positive attitudes toward standardized tests and they use considerable amount of tests in making sound educational decisions, one can assume that a majority of teachers may have some sort of formal training in measurement.

The literature on test use provides different directions that might be taken to improve testing practices and use. For example, Quinto (1977) suggests that teachers should have a deciding voice in specifying the purpose of giving a particular test and how the results should be interpreted and used. Baker (1974) proposes the use of domain-referenced testing. She suggests that behavioral objectives by themselves do not provide sufficient cues to the teacher for altering instruction to improve learning. Domain-referenced testing is presented as a viable alternative to the vague or trivial test items that often derive from unspecified objectives.

In addition, Baker (1980), among others, calls for more sweeping revisions in current test selection and development practices to improve the link between tests and instruction. She proposes four criteria for educational tests: that they be economical; closely related to instruction; have public accessibility; and offer significant experiences for students.

Most authors on the subject have recognized the need to improve teacher knowledge of tests and testing, to increase their involvement in the testing endeavour, and to facilitate their use of test results; that is, to make teachers more informed consumers of

tests and test data. Hastings et al. (1961) describe a study in which the attitudes and perceptions of test users can be improved as a result of training. Ebel (1967) has called for in-service training workshops to improve teacher competence in tests and testing. Unfortunately, to date, there has been little actual follow-up to such immediate practical suggestions.

Such training is crucial to teacher understanding and use of test data for instructional decision making. Whether one is discussing standardized tests, local tests, teacher-made or curriculum-embedded achievement tests, or alternative approaches to student assessment, teachers' knowledge and understanding of the particular kind of measure to be administrated, their commitment to use of that measure, and the links between the measure and instructional improvement will be critical (Goslin, 1967). It does not appear that teacher training institutions are providing such training at the preservice level; nor does such training appear to be systematically provided by local districts at the level of in-service. The need for and value of increased teacher knowledge in tests and testing suggests we should reconsider present teacher training priorities and mobilize support and allocate resources toward two goals: 1) making teachers more informed consumers of tests and test data, and 2) strengthening the relationship between teaching, testing, and learning.

The study reported here is one of a few that has investigated what teachers themselves know and believe about standardized tests, and how this attitude affects use of test data in the classroom. Data were collected from teachers on their activities, beliefs, and opinions related to standardized tests and test results. In general, teachers in all levels expressed positive attitudes toward the standardized tests used in the study. They liked the tests and perceived some advantageous outcomes as issuing from their use. In general, we can say that standardized testing tends to be used to support, rather than to

disrupt, existing school and teacher practices. Thus, their impact does not become very apparent in terms of reported practice. Teachers also perceived standardized tests as being an accurate measure of a pupil's achievement and scholastic ability. We might expect that teachers' attitudes toward, perceptions of, and uses of evaluation information would to some extent be a function of the type of information they received. Thus, teachers who received norm-referenced information on ability and achievement test performance might be expected to differ in some respects from teachers who had access to other kinds of information. In particular, we might expect teachers who had received diagnostic as well as norm-referenced information on pupil test performance to have found the information more useful, since the additional information would seem to be more appropriate to decisions about actual teaching than would the simple descriptive information contained in normative scores. In conclusion, the picture that our findings suggest is one in which standardized testing seems to have been easily assimilated into the classroom evaluation. Overall, teachers view standardized tests as one component of the ongoing instructional program. Our findings would be useful for proposing necessary changes in the present standardized school testing programs so that they assist the teachers in making educational decisions.

**Recommendations:**

Our findings lead us to the following recommendations about tests and about teachers. The first concerns the features inherent in standardized, norm-referenced tests which are frequently employed in mandated testing programs. Of primary concern is the content validity of the tests for making statements about an individual student's level of performance. To increase the usefulness of tests, and hence the actual use of test data, test developers need to determine instructional information needs and to attempt to

provide that information, primarily diagnostic/prescriptive, in a meaningful test score or set of scores.

On the other hand, our findings suggests the need for a complementary effort on the part of practitioners; that is, teacher training, both preservice and in-service, must begin to address the need to develop teachers' skills in educational testing. Test theory, and training and experience in testing and test interpretation will help increase the benefits derived from carefully designed standardized testing for the classroom teacher. In addition to training in the more traditional testing theory, there is a need for improving teacher training in testing. Teachers rely heavily upon their own tests, upon curriculum-embedded tests, and most heavily upon informal assessment techniques. Considering the above, improving teachers' skills in the development of reliable, sensitive (valid) techniques and instruments is certainly an appropriate recommendation for training in testing/assessment.

## REFERENCES


Ashmann, J. S., and M. D. Glock. *Evaluating Pupil Growth* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.1981.

Anastasi, A. *Psychological testing* (5th ed.) New York: Macmillan. 1982.

Anastasi, A. *Psychological testing*. New York: Macmillan. 1954.

Austin, M., and C. Morrison. *The first R: The Harvard report on reading in the elementary schools.* New York: Macmillan. 1963.

Baker, E. L. *Achievement Testing in Urban Schools: New Numbers.* St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL Monograph on Urban Education, 1980.

Baker, E. L. Beyond objectives: Domain-referenced test for evaluation and instructional improvement. *Educational Technology*, 1974, 14 (6), 10-16.

Bartel, N. R., J. J. Grill, and D. N. Bryen. Language characteristics of black children: Implications for assessment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1973,11: 351-64.

Beck, M. D., and Stetz, F. P. Teachers' opinions of standardized tests use and usefulness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco, 1979.

Bloom, B. S. Some theoretical issues relating to educational evaluation. In R. W. Tyler (ed.), *Educational evaluation: New roles, new means.* Sixty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: NSSE.

Boyd, J., B. H. Mckenna, R. E. Stake, & J. Yachinsky. *A study of testing practices in the Royal Oak (Michigan) Public Schools.* Royal Oak, Michigan: Royal Oak City School District, 1975.

Cleary, T. A., L. G. Humphreys, A. S. Kendrick, and A. Wesman. "Educational Uses of Tests with Disadvantaged Students," *American Psychologist*, 1975, 30 : 15 - 41.

Cramer, S., and M. Slakter. A scale to assess attitudes toward aptitude testing. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 1968, 1(2).

Crew, J. L., and E. N. Whitney. Criterion-Referenced testing: Usages in some member systems of the Council of great City Schools. *Journal of Negro Education*, 1978, 47 (2), 159 - 167.

Cronback, L. J. *Essentials of Psychological testing.* New York: Harper and Row, 1949.

Ebel, R. L. *The uses of standardized testing.* Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. 1977.

Ebel, R. L. *Essentials of Educational Measurement.* (3rd. ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1979.

Ebel, R. L. The social consequences of educational testing. In A. Anastasi(ed.),*Testing problems in perspective*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Ebel, R. L. Improving the competence of teachers in educational measurement. In J. Flynn and H. Garber (Eds.), *Assessing behavior: Reading in educational and psychological measurement.* Reading, Mass.: Addison - Wesley, 1967, 171 -182.

Ebel, R. L. *Essentials of Educational Measurement.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Ebel, R. L. Measurement in education. In R. L. Ebel (ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research.* (4th ed.) London: Macmillan, 1969.

Gardner, W. E. A model for creating a more hospitable achievement environment for Black elementary students. *Negro Educational Review*, 1977, 28(3), 229-236.

Gardner, W. E., and Gardner, D. J. Achievement test construction and selection for Black children. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, 1978, 6(3), 148-156.

Goldman, L. Tests should make a difference. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 1969, 2, 53-59.

Goslin, D. A. *Teachers and Testing*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Gronlund, N. E. *Measurement and evaluation in teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. 1981.

Gould, J. and J. G. Ward. *Teachers and Testing:* The teacher union response paper presented at the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers Convention Testing Workshop, Tamiment, Pennsylvania, 1980.

Hastings, J. T., P. J. Runkel, and E. E. Damrin. *Effects on use of tests by teachers trained in a summer institute*. Urbana: University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, 1961.

Hoepfner, R., W. A. Conniff, L. Hufano, J. Bastone, V. N. Ogilvie, R. Hunter, & B. L. Johnson. *CSE school test evaluations*. Three volumes. Los Angeles, California: University of California. Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1977.

Houts, P. L. Standardized testing in America, II. *National Elementary Principal*, 1975a, 54 (6): 2-3.

Houts, P. L. (ED.). *The Myth of measurability.* New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1977.

Herndon, T. *Standardized tests: Are they Worth the Costs?* Paper read to the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco. 1975.

Kellaghan, T., G. F. Madaus & P. W. Airasian. *The effects of Standardized Testing.* Kluwer-Nijhoff Pub.: Boston: 1982.

Kirkland, M. The effects of tests on students and schools. *Review of Education Research*, 1971, 41(4), 303-350.

Lortie, D. C. *School-Teacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lavin, D. E., *The prediction of Academic Performance*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1965.

Mehrens, W. A., and I. J. Lehmann. *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology (3rd. ed.)*. New York: CBS College Publishing, 1984.

Mehrens, W. A., and I. J. Lehmann. *Standardized Tests in Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Olejnik, S. F. Standardized achievement programs viewed from the perspective of the non-measurement specialist. Paper presented in the annual meeting of the *National Council on Measurement in Education*, San Francisco, 1979.

Petrosko, J. M. The quality of standardized high school mathematics tests. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*. 1978, 9(2), 137-148.

Quinto, F. Teacher-made tests--an alternative to standardized tests. *Today's Education*. 1977, 66(2), 52-53.

Rist, R. C. On understanding the processes of schooling: The contribution of labeling theory. In J. Karabel and A. H. Halsey (ed.), *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, C. 1979. The testing maze. *A National PTA White Paper*, January, 1979.

Rudman, H. C., J. Kelly, D. S. Wanous, W. A. Mehrens, C. M. Clark and A. Porter. *Integrating assessment with instruction*. The Institute for Research on Teaching. Michigan State University, 1980.

Samuda, R. J. Critical concerns in the testing of minorities: Time for new initiatives. In R. M. Bossone and M. Weiner, eds. *Proceedings from the National Conference on Testing: Major issues*. New York: Center for Advanced Study in Education, Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, 1977.

Shertzer, B. E., and J. D. Linden. *Fundamentals of individual appraisal: Assessment techniques for counsellors*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Stetz, F. P., and M. D. Beck. Comments from the classroom: Teachers' and students' opinions of achievement tests. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *National Council on Measurement in Education*, San Francisco, 1979.

Tyler, R. W. Critique of the issue on educational and psychological testing. *Review of Educational Research*. 1968, 38: 102 - 107.

Tyler, R. W. (ed.), *Educational evaluation: New roles, new means.* Sixty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: NSSE.1969.

Tyler, R. W., and S. H. White, Chairmen. *Testing, teaching and learning*. Report of a Conference on Research on Testing. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1979.

Tollefson, N. F. *Testing and Assessment in Elementary School Guidance Programs*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston: 1975.

Walker, C. B. *CSE criterion-referenced test handbook*. Los Angeles, California: Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1977.

# APPENDIXES

## Appendix A

Elementary to Junior High School Teachers' Responses

TABLE 1

**Total Number of Teachers Responding by Grade Gropp**

| Grades | No of Questionnaires sent | No of Teachers Responded | Percent of Teachers Responded |
|---|---|---|---|
| K-3 | 75 | 56 | 75 |
| 4-6 | 75 | 59 | 79 |
| 7-9 | 75 | 63 | 84 |
| SEC | 50 | 25 | 50 |
| TOTAL | 275 | 203 | 74 |

TABLE 2

Familiarity With the Purpose of the "Student Profile Cards".

| Grades | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | No of Teachers | Percent of Teachers |
| K-3 | 55 | 98 | 01 | 02 |
| 4-6 | 58 | 98 | 01 | 02 |
| 7-9 | 59 | 94 | 04 | 06 |
| SEC | 21 | 84 | 04 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 193 | 95 | 10 | 05 |
| Standard Error | | ± 3 | | ± 3 |

TABLE 3

Teachers Believe that Student Profile Cards Provide Some Information

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | | F | | G | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| K-3 | 43 | 79 | 48 | 86 | 42 | 75 | 11 | 20 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 4-6 | 53 | 90 | 53 | 90 | 48 | 81 | 10 | 17 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 2 | 3 |
| 7-9 | 42 | 67 | 51 | 81 | 50 | 79 | 21 | 33 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 3 |
| SEC | 15 | 60 | 18 | 72 | 18 | 72 | 4 | 16 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 28 | 3 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 153 | 75 | 170 | 83 | 158 | 78 | 46 | 23 | 17 | 8 | 35 | 17 | 9 | 4 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 5 | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 4 | | ± 5 | | ± 3 |

Key: No. stands for number of teachers.
Percent stands for percent of teachers responded.

A. Student's intelligence B. Student's reading achievement C. Student's arithmetic achievement

D. Overall achievement across all subject areas E. Behavioural or emotional difficulties

F. Demographic characteristics G. Unsure

TABLE 4

Number and Percent of Teachers Indicating Familiarity with and Understanding the Meaning of the Results From the Following Standardized Tests:

| Grades | L-T | | GMRT | | CTBS | | KM | | WISC-R | | PMA | | SAT | | PEABO | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 22 | 39 | 51 | 91 | 54 | 96 | 3 | 5 | 33 | 59 | 42 | 75 | 9 | 16 | 11 | 20 |
| 4-6 | 47 | 80 | 52 | 88 | 57 | 97 | 3 | 5 | 30 | 51 | 37 | 63 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 8 |
| 7-9 | 52 | 83 | 23 | 37 | 52 | 83 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 43 | 12 | 19 | 21 | 33 | 4 | 6 |
| SEC | 8 | 32 | 10 | 40 | 12 | 48 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 72 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 129 | 64 | 136 | 67 | 175 | 86 | 9 | 4 | 108 | 53 | 97 | 48 | 43 | 21 | 30 | 15 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 5 | | ± 3 | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ± 5 |

Key: No stands for number of teachers. Per. stands for Percentage of teachers.

L-T= Lorge-Thorndike GMRT: Gates MacGinitie Reading Test CTBS: Canadian Test of Basic Skills

KM: Key Math WISC-R: PMA SAT: Stanford Achievement Test PEABO: Peabody.

TABLE 4 (contd.)

Number and Percent of Teachers Indicating Familiarity With and Understanding the Meaning of the Results From the Following Standardized Tests:

| Grades | WRAT-R | | MAT | | OLMAT | | STEP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent |
| K-3 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 23 | 10 | 18 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 2 | 3 |
| 7-9 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 24 | 38 |
| SEC | 13 | 52 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 31 | 15 | 31 | 15 | 32 | 16 | 27 | 13 |
| Standard Error | | ± 5 | | ± 5 | | ± 5 | | ± 5 |

Key: WRAT-R: Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) MAT: Metropolitan Achievement Test

OLMAT: Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test STEP: S.T.E.P.

TABLE 5

Availability of Tests to Administer in the School

| Grades | L-T | | GMRT | | CTBS | | KM | | WISC-R | | PMA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent |
| K-3 | 16 | 29 | 46 | 82 | 45 | 80 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 34 | 29 | 52 |
| 4-6 | 45 | 76 | 52 | 88 | 48 | 81 | 3 | 5 | 25 | 42 | 30 | 51 |
| 7-9 | 44 | 70 | 25 | 40 | 44 | 70 | 1 | 2 | 29 | 46 | 9 | 14 |
| SEC | 10 | 40 | 16 | 64 | 18 | 72 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 44 | 11 | 44 |
| TOTAL | 115 | 57 | 139 | 68 | 155 | 76 | 9 | 4 | 84 | 41 | 79 | 39 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ± 7 | | ± 7 |

Key: L-T: Lorge-Thorndike GMRT: Gates MacGinitie Reading Test CTBS: Canadian Test of Basic Skills
KM: Key Math WISC-R P.M.A.

TABLE 5 (contd.)

Availability of Tests to Administer in the School

| Grades | SAT | | PEAB | | WRAT-R | | MAT | | OLMAT | | STEP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent | No | Percent |
| K-3 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 9 | 16 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 19 | 2 | 3 |
| 7-9 | 12 | 19 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 21 | 33 |
| SEC | 7 | 28 | 7 | 28 | 8 | 32 | 14 | 56 | 11 | 44 | 3 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 30 | 15 | 14 | 7 | 20 | 10 | 34 | 17 | 38 | 19 | 27 | 13 |
| Standard Error | | ± 5 | | ± 4 | | ± 4 | | ± 5 | | ± 6 | | ± 5 |

Key: SAT: Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) Peabody WRAT-R: Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised

MAT: Metropolitan Achievement Test OLMAT: Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test S.T.E.P.

TABLE 6

Sources of Learning About the Tests

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | | F | | G | | H | | I | | J | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No | Per. | No | Per. | No | Per. | No | Per. | No | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No | Per |
| K-3 | 36 | 64 | 25 | 45 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 25 | 20 | 36 | 18 | 32 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 20 | 4 | 7 |
| 4-6 | 34 | 58 | 29 | 49 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 25 | 16 | 27 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 31 | 5 | 8 |
| 7-9 | 34 | 54 | 17 | 27 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 32 | 4 | 6 | 23 | 37 | 3 | 5 |
| SEC | 6 | 24 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 16 | 8 | 32 | 7 | 28 | 10 | 40 | 16 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 3 | 12 |
| TOTAL | 110 | 54 | 76 | 37 | 20 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 40 | 20 | 55 | 27 | 66 | 33 | 11 | 5 | 56 | 28 | 15 | 7 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 4 | | ± 4 | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 7 | | ± 3 | | ± 6 | | ± 4 |

Key: A. Other teachers B. My principal C. From an inservice D. Special Education consultant

E. Remedial Reading consultant F. School Psychologist G. My university training H. Testing coordinator

I. School counsellor J. Other (specify)

No. stands for number of teachers. Per stands for percent of teachers responded

TABLE 7

In Terms of Standardized Tests in the E. C. S. D.

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 12 | 21 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 18 | 19 | 34 |
| 4-6 | 12 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 39 |
| 7-9 | 10 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 28 | 44 |
| SEC | 6 | 24 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 28 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 20 | 12 | 6 | 45 | 22 | 19 | 9 | 72 | 35 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ± 6 | | ± 4 | | ± 7 |

Key: A. there are only a few (2-3) that we are allowed to use. B. there are many available but difficult to obtai
C. there are many available which are relatively easy to obtain. D. apart from those which must be given, we are discouraged from using others. E. unsure.

TABLE 8

Current uses of Standardized Tests in the School

| Grades | L-T | | GMRT | | CTBS | | K-M | | WISC-R | | PMA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 21 | 38 | 34 | 61 | 53 | 95 | 3 | 5 | 20 | 36 | 45 | 80 |
| 4-6 | 45 | 76 | 37 | 63 | 53 | 90 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 36 | 38 | 64 |
| 7-9 | 50 | 79 | 23 | 37 | 57 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 32 | 11 | 17 |
| SEC | 17 | 68 | 16 | 64 | 24 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 68 | 15 | 60 |
| TOTAL | 133 | 66 | 110 | 54 | 187 | 92 | 4 | 2 | 78 | 38 | 109 | 54 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 4 | | ± .49 | | ± 7 | | ± 7 |

Key: A. Lerge-Thorndike B. Gates Macginitie Reading Test C. Canadian Test of Basic Skills D. Key Math

E. WISC-R F. P.M.A.

TABLE 8 (Contd.)

| Grades | Current uses of Standardized Tests in the School | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SAT | | PEAB | | WRAT-R | | MAT | | OLMAT | | STEP | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 8 | 14 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 2 | 3 |
| 7-9 | 9 | 14 | 1 | .2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 35 | 56 |
| SEC | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 20 | 6 | 24 | 6 | 24 | 1 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 15 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 23 | 11 | 27 | 13 | 39 | 19 |
| Standard Error | | ± 4 | | ± 2 | | ± 3 | | ± 4 | | ± 5 | | ± 6 |

Key: SAT: Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) PEAB: Peabody WRAT-R: Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
MAT: Metropolitan Achievement Test OLMAT: Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test STEP: S.T.E.P.

TABLE 9

The Best Person to Contact for Learning About the Tests

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | | F | | G | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No | Perc. | No | Perc. |
| K-3 | 12 | 21 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 23 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 18 | 4 | 7 |
| 4-6 | 11 | 19 | 5 | 8 | 22 | 37 | 15 | 25 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| 7-9 | 16 | 25 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 29 | 1 | 2 |
| SEC | 13 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 52 | 26 | 12 | 6 | 44 | 22 | 38 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 37 | 18 | 8 | 4 |
| Standard | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 4 | | ± 5 | | ± 3 |

Key: A. the school psychologist B. other teachers C. the consultant in the area that I was interested in assessing D. my principal E. school district testing coordinator F. school counsellor G. there is no one who could provide me with much information and so I would have to find out from a variety of sources on my own.

No stands for Number of Teachers and Perc. stands for Percent of Teachers.

TABLE 10

Interested in Knowning More About the Standardized Tests

| Grades | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 43 | 77 | 9 | 16 |
| 4-6 | 45 | 76 | 11 | 19 |
| 7-9 | 44 | 70 | 18 | 29 |
| SEC | 17 | 68 | 07 | 28 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 73 | 45 | 22 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 6 |

TABLE 11

Opinion About the Usefulness of "Student Profile Card"

| Grades | A | | | | | | B | | | | | | C | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 34 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 15 | 27 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 5 | 38 | 64 | 14 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 38 | 64 | 14 | 24 | 1 | 2 | 25 | 42 | 26 | 44 |
| 7-9 | 6 | 10 | 33 | 52 | 18 | 29 | 15 | 24 | 37 | 59 | 12 | 19 | 4 | 6 | 26 | 41 | 31 | 49 |
| SEC | 3 | 12 | 14 | 56 | 5 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 60 | 6 | 24 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 48 | 5 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 14 | 7 | 104 | 51 | 43 | 21 | 18 | 9 | 109 | 54 | 42 | 21 | 10 | 5 | 76 | 37 | 77 | 38 |
| Standard Error | | ±4 | | ±7 | | ±6 | | ±4 | | ±7 | | ±6 | | ±3 | | ±7 | | ±7 |

Key: No. stands for Number of Teachers and Per stands for Percent of Teachers

A. Deciding what level to begin teaching reading and/or math with a child. B. Indicating accurately the child's progress from year to year. C. Providing information regarding the student's potential to achieve (ability).

0 = not useful 1 = useful on occasion 2 = very useful

TABLE 11 (contd.)

Opinion About the Usefulness of "Student Profile Card"

| Grades | D | | | | | | E | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 6 | 11 | 19 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 7 | 13 |
| 4-6 | 11 | 19 | 33 | 56 | 9 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 24 | 41 | 26 | 44 |
| 7-9 | 16 | 25 | 36 | 57 | 10 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 29 | 46 | 31 | 49 |
| SEC | 7 | 28 | 15 | 60 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 40 | 10 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 20 | 103 | 51 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 82 | 40 | 74 | 36 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ±7 | | ±4 | | ±2 | | ±7 | | ±7 |

Key: D. Deciding whether a child should repeat a grade E. Special program placement decisions.

No. stands for "Number of Teachers" Per. stands for "Percent of Teachers"

0 = not useful 1 = useful on occasion 2 = very useful

TABLE 12

Percentile Score on a System-Wide Achievement Test

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. | No. | Perc. |
| K-3 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 50 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 11 |
| 4-6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 66 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 20 |
| 7-9 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 56 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 21 |
| SEC | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 60 | 9 | 4 | 33 | 16 |
| Standard Error | | ± 3 | | ± 4 | | ± 0 | | ± 7 | | ± 3 | | ± 5 |

Key: No. stands for "Number of Teachers" Perc. stands for "Percent of Teachers"

A: answered 50% of the questions correctly B: is alow achiever C: is a high achiever

D: is an average achiever E. both a & b F. none of the above

TABLE 13

Standardized Tests Provide Item Analysis Information

| Grades | Yes | | No | | Unsure | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 25 | 45 | 14 | 25 | 33 | 59 |
| 4-6 | 17 | 29 | 11 | 19 | 29 | 49 |
| 7-9 | 16 | 25 | 12 | 19 | 32 | 51 |
| SEC | 9 | 36 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 67 | 33 | 42 | 21 | 104 | 51 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ±7 |

TABLE 14

Uses of Test Information to Compare Students' Performance in the System

| Grades | Yes | | No | | Don't Know | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 38 | 68 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 21 |
| 4-6 | 40 | 68 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 17 |
| 7-9 | 38 | 60 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 24 |
| SEC | 16 | 64 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 28 |
| TOTAL | 132 | 65 | 20 | 10 | 44 | 22 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 4 | | ± 6 |

TABLE 15

Advantage and Disadvantage of Standardized Tests

| Grades | Advantage | | Disadvantage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 38 | 68 | 11 | 20 |
| 4-6 | 48 | 81 | 3 | 5 |
| 7-9 | 48 | 76 | 8 | 13 |
| SEC | 14 | 56 | 6 | 24 |
| TOTAL | 148 | 73 | 28 | 14 |
| Standard Error | | ±6 | | ±5 |

TABLE 16

Important Usage of Standardized Tests

| Grades | Teacher Evaluation | | | | | | | | Program Evaluation | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 21 | 38 | 24 | 43 | 10 | 18 | 26 | 46 | 15 | 27 | 3 | 5 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 29 | 49 | 13 | 22 | 25 | 42 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 5 |
| 7-9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 24 | 30 | 48 | 9 | 14 | 24 | 38 | 18 | 29 | 3 | 5 |
| SEC | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 36 | 9 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 64 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 7 | 3 | 22 | 11 | 57 | 28 | 92 | 45 | 32 | 16 | 91 | 45 | 47 | 23 | 10 | 5 |
| Standard Error | | ± 2 | | ±4 | | ±6 | | ±7 | | ±5 | | ±7 | | ± 6 | | ±3 |

Key: "No." stands for "Number of Teachers" "Per." stands for "Percent of Teachers"

From 1 to 4 in order of most important usage; where 1 = most important.

TABLE 16 (contd.)

Important Usage of Standardized Tests

| Grades | Administrative Data | | | | | | | | Individual Student Program Planning | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 22 | 39 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 16 | 29 | 19 | 34 | 16 | 29 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 20 |
| 4-6 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 10 | 19 | 32 | 15 | 25 | 24 | 41 | 14 | 24 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 8 |
| 7-9 | 13 | 21 | 17 | 27 | 11 | 17 | 14 | 22 | 32 | 51 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 11 |
| SEC | 7 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 7 | 28 | 12 | 48 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 53 | 26 | 29 | 14 | 46 | 23 | 52 | 26 | 87 | 43 | 41 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 27 | 13 |
| Standard Error | | ±6 | | ±5 | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ± 5 | | ± 5 |

Key: "No." stands for "Number of Teachers" "Per." stands for "Percent of Teachers"

From 1 to 4 in order of most important usage; where 1 = most important.

TABLE 17

Usage of the Different Aspects of the Student Profile Card

| Grades | Student's Intelligence (ability) | | | | | | Student's Reading Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequently | | Sometimes | | Never | | Frequently | | Sometimes | | Never | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percen |
| K-3 | 6 | 11 | 40 | 71 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 27 | 27 | 48 | 9 | 16 |
| 4-6 | 10 | 17 | 42 | 71 | 7 | 12 | 23 | 39 | 31 | 53 | 4 | 7 |
| 7-9 | 15 | 24 | 42 | 67 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 22 | 37 | 59 | 11 | 17 |
| SEC | 9 | 36 | 7 | 28 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 48 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 24 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 20 | 131 | 65 | 24 | 12 | 64 | 32 | 98 | 48 | 30 | 15 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 7 | | ± 5 | | ±7 | | ± 7 | | ± 5 |

TABLE 17 (contd.)

Usage of the Different Aspects of the Student Profile Card

| Grades | Student's Arithmetic Achievement | | | | | | Demographic Characteristics | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequently | | Sometimes | | Never | | Frequently | | Sometimes | | Never | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Perc |
| K-3 | 9 | 16 | 32 | 57 | 10 | 18 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 23 | 31 | 55 |
| 4-6 | 16 | 27 | 30 | 51 | 10 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 21 | 36 | 22 | 37 |
| 7-9 | 13 | 21 | 32 | 51 | 17 | 27 | 3 | 5 | 25 | 40 | 32 | 51 |
| SEC | 10 | 40 | 5 | 20 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 16 | 6 | 24 | 11 | 44 |
| TOTAL | 48 | 24 | 99 | 49 | 43 | 21 | 12 | 6 | 65 | 32 | 96 | 47 |
| Standard Error | | ±6 | | ±7 | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ±7 | | ± 7 |

TABLE 18

Other Subject Areas and Other Test Results Assessed and Included On The Student Profile Cards

| Grade | Yes | | No | | Unsure | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 10 | 18 | 24 | 43 | 19 | 34 |
| 4-6 | 13 | 22 | 23 | 39 | 23 | 39 |
| 7-9 | 10 | 16 | 21 | 33 | 27 | 43 |
| SEC | 4 | 16 | 9 | 36 | 10 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 18 | 77 | 38 | 79 | 39 |
| Standard Error | | ± 5 | | ± 7 | | ± 7 |

TABLE 19

Students' Grade Level Achievement In The Classroom Is That Attained On Standardized Achievement Tests

| Grades | Lower than | | Higher than | | Approximately the same as | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 23 | 27 | 48 |
| 4-6 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 19 | 33 | 56 |
| 7-9 | 15 | 24 | 8 | 13 | 37 | 59 |
| SEC | 3 | 12 | 5 | 20 | 11 | 44 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 17 | 37 | 18 | 108 | 53 |
| Standard Error | | ± 5 | | ± 5 | | ± 7 |

TABLE 20

The Standardized Tests Assess Similar Content

| Grades | Yes | | No | | Unsure | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 23 | 41 | 23 | 41 | 5 | 9 |
| 4-6 | 25 | 42 | 27 | 46 | 3 | 5 |
| 7-9 | 17 | 27 | 20 | 32 | 21 | 33 |
| SEC | 9 | 36 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 32 |
| TOTAL | 74 | 36 | 75 | 37 | 37 | 18 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 5 |

TABLE 21

Results From The Group Intelligence Tests

| Grades | A | | B | | C | | D | | E | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 19 | 34 | 15 | 27 | 10 | 18 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 5 |
| 4-6 | 16 | 27 | 13 | 22 | 15 | 25 | 7 | 12 | 4 | 7 |
| 7-9 | 19 | 30 | 15 | 24 | 12 | 19 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 16 |
| SEC | 6 | 24 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 60 | 30 | 47 | 23 | 42 | 21 | 22 | 11 | 22 | 11 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 4 | | ± 4 |

Key: A. supply a valid and reliable estimate of the child's learning potential B. make placement decisions concerning special programs C. screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much higher than their achievement D. Screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much lower than their achievement. E. Unsure.

TABLE 22

Month(s) Of The School Year That Teachers Would Prefer To Receive The Tests Results

Achievement Tests

| Grades | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | 12 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| k-3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 30 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 30 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 7-9 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 38 | 16 | 25 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| SEC | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 13 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 37 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | ½ | 56 | 28 | 29 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Standard Error | ± 3 | | ± 3 | | ± 2 | | ± 3 | | ± 5 | | ± 5 | | ±0 | | ± .98 | | ± 6 | | ± 5 | | ± 2 | | ±1 | |

Key: 1. January 2. February 3. March 4. April 5. May 6. June 7. July 8. August 9. September 10. October 11. November 12. December.

No. stands for "Number" and "Per" stands for "percent of Teachers"

TABLE 22 (contd.)

Month(s) Of The School Year That Teachers Would Prefer To Receive The Tests Results

Ability Tests

| Grades | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | 12 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Pe |
| K-3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 32 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 42 | 17 | 29 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 7-9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 43 | 17 | 27 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| SEC | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 44 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | ½ | 81 | 40 | 43 | 21 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Standard | | ±3 | | ±3 | | ±1 | | ±2 | | ±3 | | ± 3 | | ± 0 | | ±.98 | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ± 1 |

Key: 1. January 2. February 3. March 4. April 5. May 6. June 7. July 8. August

9. September 10 October 11. November 12. December

"No." stands for "Number of Teachers" and "Per." stands for "Percent of Teachers"

TABLE 23

Information On The Student Profile Card Very Helpful

| Grades | Yes | | No | | Only on occasion | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 9 | 16 | 16 | 29 | 30 | 54 |
| 4-6 | 17 | 29 | 8 | 14 | 34 | 58 |
| 7-9 | 13 | 21 | 11 | 17 | 39 | 62 |
| SEC | 6 | 24 | 6 | 24 | 10 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 45 | 22 | 41 | 20 | 113 | 56 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 6 | | ± 7 |

TABLE 24

Information On The Student Profile Card Helpful For Placement Decisions

| Grades | Yes | | No | | Not Applicable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 34 | 61 | 8 | 14 | 13 | 23 |
| 4-6 | 38 | 64 | 10 | 17 | 8 | 14 |
| 7-9 | 32 | 51 | 6 | 10 | 23 | 37 |
| SEC | 11 | 44 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 32 |
| TOTAL | 115 | 57 | 26 | 13 | 52 | 26 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 5 | | ± 6 |

TABLE 25

Preference To Have The Standardized Test Results

| Grades | A | | B | | C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 16 | 29 | 35 | 63 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 20 | 34 | 33 | 56 | 3 | 5 |
| 7-9 | 29 | 46 | 32 | 51 | 1 | 2 |
| SEC | 7 | 28 | 12 | 48 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 72 | 35 | 112 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 | | ± 2 |

Key: A. as it is currently B. more extensively than final scores (so that results might be more helpful diagnostically) C. Other, Please specify.....

TABLE 26

Interpreting The Test Results On The Profile Card

| Grades | Percentiles | | | | | | | | Grade Equivalents | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. |
| K-3 | 8 | 14 | 25 | 45 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 11 | 37 | 66 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 15 | 25 | 20 | 34 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 32 | 54 | 19 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 7-9 | 26 | 41 | 9 | 14 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 22 | 35 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 2 |
| SEC | 2 | 8 | 13 | 52 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 72 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 51 | 25 | 67 | 33 | 24 | 12 | 23 | 11 | 98 | 48 | 53 | 26 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Standard Error | | ±6 | | ±7 | | ± 5 | | ± 4 | | ± 7 | | ± 6 | | ± 3 | | ± 1 |

Key: 1 to 4 in order of preference; 1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred.

TABLE 26 (contd.)

Interpreting The Test Results On The Profile Card

| Grades | Standard Scores | | | | | | | | Raw Scores | | | | | | | | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | |
| | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | No. | Per. | |
| k-3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 30 | 54 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 33 | 59 | 00 |
| 4-6 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 34 | 58 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 34 | 58 | 00 |
| 7-9 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 16 | 22 | 35 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 30 | 48 | 00 |
| SEC | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 40 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 28 | 9 | 36 | 00 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 4 | 29 | 14 | 96 | 47 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 28 | 14 | 106 | 52 | 00 |
| Standard Error | | ± 3 | | ± 5 | | ± 7 | | ± 4 | | ± 3 | | ± 4 | | ± 5 | | ± 7 | 00 |

Key: 1 to 4 in order of preference; 1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred.

TABLE 27

Standardized Testing Procedures Are A Beneficial Asset

| Grades | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 37 | 66 | 14 | 25 |
| 4-6 | 43 | 73 | 11 | 19 |
| 7-9 | 51 | 81 | 7 | 11 |
| SEC | 18 | 72 | 4 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 73 | 36 | 18 |
| Standard Error | | ±6 | | ± 5 |

TABLE 28

Standardized Test Results Be Abolished Or Used only When Required In Specific Instances

| Grades | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 16 | 29 | 35 | 63 |
| 4-6 | 9 | 15 | 44 | 75 |
| 7-9 | 14 | 22 | 47 | 75 |
| SEC | 5 | 20 | 16 | 64 |
| TOTAL | 44 | 22 | 142 | 70 |
| Standard Error | | ± 6 | | ± 6 |

TABLE 29

Standardized Testing Could Be More Effective If Some Changes Were Made

| Grades | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| K-3 | 32 | 57 | 20 | 36 |
| 4-6 | 34 | 58 | 20 | 34 |
| 7-9 | 40 | 63 | 16 | 25 |
| SEC | 12 | 48 | 9 | 36 |
| TOTAL | 118 | 58 | 65 | 32 |
| Standard Error | | ± 7 | | ± 7 |

## Appendix B

## High School Teachers' Responses

TABLE 30

High school teachers indicating familiarity with and understanding the meaning of the results from the following standardized tests

| Familiarity with and understanding the meaning of the following tests results | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lorge-Thorndike | 30 | 40 | ±11 |
| Gates MacGinitie Reading Test | 19 | 25 | ±10 |
| Canadian Test of Basic Skills | 28 | 37 | ±11 |
| Key Math | 03 | 04 | ±05 |
| WISC-R | 21 | 28 | ±10 |
| P.M.A. | 05 | 07 | ±06 |
| Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) | 27 | 36 | ±11 |
| Peabody | 03 | 04 | ±05 |
| Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) | 05 | 07 | ±06 |
| Metropolitan Achievement Test | 04 | 05 | ±05 |
| Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test | 02 | 03 | ±04 |
| S.T.E.P. | 13 | 17 | ±09 |

TABLE 31

Availability of tests to administer in the school

| Standardized Tests | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lorge-Thorndike | 11 | 15 | ±08 |
| Gates MacGinitie Reading Test | 05 | 07 | ±06 |
| Canadian Test of Basic Skills | 10 | 13 | ±08 |
| Key Math | 01 | 01 | ±02 |
| WISC-R | 07 | 09 | ±07 |
| P.M.A. | 01 | 01 | ±02 |
| Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) | 10 | 13 | ±08 |
| Peabody | 02 | 03 | ±04 |
| Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) | 03 | 04 | ±05 |
| Metropolitan Achievement Test | 03 | 04 | ±05 |
| Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test | 04 | 05 | ±05 |
| S.T.E.P. | 03 | 04 | ±05 |

TABLE 32

Sources of learning about the tests

| Sources of Learning | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Other teachers | 16 | 21 | ±9 |
| b. My principal | 06 | 08 | ±6 |
| c. From an inservice | 02 | 03 | ±4 |
| d. Special Education Consultant | 03 | 04 | ±5 |
| e. Remedial Reading Consultant | 04 | 05 | ±5 |
| f. School psychologist | 16 | 21 | ±9 |
| g. My university training | 21 | 28 | ±10 |
| h. Testing coordinator | 05 | 07 | ±6 |
| i. Other | 04 | 05 | ±5 |

TABLE 33

Current uses of standardized tests in the high schools

| Standardized Tests | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lorge-Thorndike | 02 | 03 | ±4 |
| Gates MacGinitie Reading Test | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Canadian Test of Basic Skills | 03 | 04 | ±5 |
| Key Math | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| WISC-R | 03 | 04 | ±5 |
| P.M.A. | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) | 05 | 07 | ±6 |
| Peabody | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| Metropolitan Achievement Test | 01 | 01 | ±2 |
| Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test | 01 | 01 | ±2 |
| S.T.E.P. | 00 | 00 | 00 |

TABLE 34

The best person to contact for learning about the tests

| The Best Person | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| The School Psychologist | 28 | 37 | ±11 |
| Other Teachers | 07 | 09 | ±07 |
| Assessment Consultant | 08 | 11 | ±07 |
| School Principal | 09 | 12 | ±08 |
| School Testing Coordinator | 06 | 08 | ±06 |
| Find Out From a Variety of Sources On My Own | 04 | 05 | ±05 |

TABLE 35

Interest in Knowing more about the standardized Tests

| Teachers' Interests In Knowing About The Standardized Tests | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| True | 38 | 51 | ±12 |
| False | 14 | 19 | ±09 |

TABLE 36

Extension of student profile card to the high school

| Teacher Opinions | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 27 | 36 | ±11 |
| No | 10 | 13 | ±08 |
| Unsure | 19 | 25 | ±10 |

TABLE 37

Usefulness of standardized tests in discussing a student's achievement

| Teacher Opinions | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 29 | 39 | ±11 |
| No | 08 | 11 | ±07 |
| Unsure | 11 | 15 | ±08 |

TABLE 38

Areas assessed with standardized tests

| Areas | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student's Intelligence (ability) | 32 | 43 | ±11 |
| Student's Language Arts Skills | 33 | 44 | ±11 |
| Student's Mathematics | 22 | 29 | ±10 |
| Other Subject Areas | 02 | 03 | ±04 |

TABLE 39

Form of Information Provided to Teachers

| Forms of Information | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade scores | 26 | 35 | ±11 |
| National Percentiles | 19 | 25 | ±11 |
| Local Percentiles | 26 | 35 | ±11 |
| Raw Scores | 08 | 11 | ±07 |
| Item Analyses | 21 | 28 | ±10 |
| Other | 00 | 00 | 00 |

TABLE 40

Personal Uses of Standardized Test Results

| Uses of Standardized Tests Results | Number of Teachers | Percent of Teachers | Standard Error |
|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional Planning | 20 | 27 | ±10 |
| Reporting to Parents | 17 | 23 | ±10 |
| Indicates accurately student's progress from year to year | 10 | 13 | ±08 |
| Providing Information on Child's Potential to Achieve (ability) | 38 | 51 | ±12 |
| Screening for Possible Special Education Placement | 25 | 33 | ±11 |
| Other | 03 | 04 | ±05 |

## Appendix C

## Elementary and Junior High School Teacher Questionnaire

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the thesis submitted for microfilming.

Please refer to the National Library of Canada target (sheet 1, frame 2) entitled:

CANADIAN THESES

NOTICE

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage.

Veuillez consulter la cible de la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada (microfiche 1, image 2) intitulée:

THÈSES CANADIENNES

AVIS

# TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I teach the following level: (check one)

___ grade K-3
___ grade 4-6
___ grade 7-9
___ grade 10-12
___ Special Education classroom (please specify level): _____

2. I am familiar with the purpose of the "Student Profile Cards".

___ Yes ___ No

3. I believe that Student Profile cards provide information in terms of: (check one or more)

___ a. student's intelligence
___ b. student's reading achievement
___ c. student's arithmetic achievement
___ d. overall achievement across all subject areas
___ e. behavioural or emotional difficulties
___ f. demographic characteristics
___ g. unsure

4. I am familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from the following standardized tests: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

5. If I requested it, I would be able to obtain the following tests to administer in my school: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

6. I learned about the tests which I know about from: (check one or more)

___ a. other teachers
___ b. my principal
___ c. from an inservice
___ d. Special Education consultant
___ e. Remedial Reading consultant
___ f. School Psychologist
___ g. my university training
___ h. testing coordinator
___ i. school counsellor
___ j. other(specify) _____

7. In terms of standardized tests in the E.C.S.B.: (check one)

___ a. there are only a few (2-3) that we are allowed to use.
___ b. there are many available but difficult to obtain.
___ c. there are many available which are relatively easy to obtain.
___ d. apart from those which must be given, we are discouraged from using others.
___ e. unsure

8. The following tests are currently used in my school: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

9. If I was interested in learning more about the standardized tests available, the best person(s) to contact would be: (check one)

___ a. the school psychologist

___ b. other teachers

___ c. the consultant in the area that I was interested in assessing

___ d. my principal

___ e. School district testing coordinator

___ f. school counsellor

___ g. there is no one who could provide me with much information and so I would have to find out from a variety of sources on my own.

10. I am interested in knowing more about the standardized tests available.

_____ Yes _____ No

11. A "student profile card" is useful for: (Please circle either 0, 1, or 2 for each of the following items) where:

0 = not useful
1 = useful on occasion
2 = very useful

(0 1 2) a. Deciding what level to begin teaching reading and/or math with a child.

(0 1 2) b. Indicating accurately the child's progress from year to year.

(0 1 2) c. Providing information regarding the student's potential to achieve (ability).

(0 1 2) d. Deciding whether a child should repeat a grade.

(0 1 2) e. Special program placement decisions.

12. A child who attains a percentile score of 50 on a system-wide achievement test: (check best answer)

___ a. answered 50% of the questions correctly

___ b. is a low achiever

___ c. is a high achiever

___ d. is an average achiever

___ e. both a & b

___ f. none of the above

13. Do all of the standardized tests given in your system provide item analysis information?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure

14. With the test information provided to your school, could you determine how your grade performed compared to all the children at that same grade level in your system?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Don't Know

15. With respect to #14, if you could determine this, would this be more of an advantage or disadvantage of standardized tests? (check one)

_____ advantage _____ disadvantage

16. In my opinion, standardized tests are used for: (PLEASE RANK each of the following from 1 to 4 in order of most important usage; where 1 = most important)

_____ teacher evaluation
_____ program evaluation
_____ administrative data
_____ individual student program planning

17. Indicate your usage of the following aspects of the Student Profile card.

| | Frequently | Sometimes | Never |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student's intelligence (ability) | ..... | ..... | |
| Student's reading achievement | ..... | ..... | |
| Student's arithmetic achievement | ..... | ..... | |
| Demographic characteristics | ..... | ..... | |

18. In addition or instead of the standardized tests given at your school, are there other subject areas which you would also like to see assessed and included on the student profile cards; or other test results already available which you would like included on the profile card.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure

If Yes, which subject(s) _____

_____

_____

19. By and large, I find that students' grade level achievement in the classroom is ..... that attained on standardized achievement tests.

..... a. lower than

..... b. higher than

..... c. approximately the same as

20. Generally speaking, the standardized tests assess similar content to that which I teach in the classroom.

..... Yes ..... No ..... Unsure

21. Results from the group intelligence tests are best used to: (check one)

..... a. supply a valid and reliable estimate of the child's learning potential

..... b. make placement decisions concerning special programs

..... c. screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much higher than their achievement

..... d. screen for those individuals whose estimated ability is much lower than their achievement

..... e. unsure

22. Indicate which month(s) of the school year that you would prefer to receive the results for:

a. achievement tests: .....

b. ability (intelligence) tests: .....

23. I find the information on the student profile card very helpful when discussing a child's level of functioning with parents. (check one)

..... Yes ..... No ..... Only on occasion

24. I find the information on the student profile card helpful when making classroom placement decisions.

_____ Yes (a bit) _____ No _____ Not Applicable

25. How would you prefer to have the standardized test results provided to you?

_____ a. as it is currently

_____ b. more extensively than final scores (so that results might be more helpful diagnostically)

_____ c. other, please specify .....

26. When interpreting the test results on the profile card, I prefer the information be reported as: (Please rank from 1 to 4 in order of preference; 1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred.)

_____ percentiles

_____ grade equivalents

_____ standard scores

_____ raw scores

_____ other, please specify .....

27. I feel that standardized testing procedures in my school are a beneficial asset as they currently exist.

_____ Yes _____ No

28. I feel that there is too much emphasis placed on standardized test results, and would like to see them abolished, or used only when required in specific instances.

_____ Yes _____ No

29. I think that the idea of standardized testing is a good one, but that it could be more effective if some changes were made.

_____ Yes _____ No

If "YES", please specify the changes which you would like to see:

.....

.....

.....

Appendix D

High School Teacher Questionnaire

## High School Questionnaire

The following questionnaire is designed to examine your opinions concerning the current use and possible future use of standardized tests within the Edmonton Separate School System. Standardized tests refer to those where each student's performance is assessed in relation to a standardized sample of students the same age and/or grade. This questionnaire is not concerned with the Alberta Education Comprehensive Exams. The AUSS currently utilizes various standardized tests in the elementary and junior high divisions and is interested in your opinion concerning extending some of this usage to the High School level. It is, therefore, imperative that you respond to the enclosed questionnaire as your viewpoints will be considered before any decisions are made in this regard. Your first reaction and candid response to the items on this questionnaire are appreciated, and all responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

1. I am familiar with and understand the meaning of the results from the following standardized tests: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

2. If I requested it, I would be able to obtain the following tests to administer in my school: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

3. I learned about the tests which I know about from: (check one or more)

___ a. other teachers
___ b. my principal
___ c. from an inservice
___ d. Special Education consultant
___ e. Remedial Reading consultant
___ f. School Psychologist
___ g. my university training
___ h. testing coordinator
___ i. other (specify role): _____

4. The following tests are currently used in my school: (check one or more)

___ Lorge-Thorndike
___ Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
___ Canadian Test of Basic Skills
___ Key Math
___ WISC-R
___ P.M.A.
___ Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)
___ Peabody
___ Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R)
___ Metropolitan Achievement Test
___ Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test
___ S.T.E.P.

5. If I was interested in learning more about the standardized tests available, the best person(s) to contact would be: (check one)

____ a. the school psychologist
____ b. other teachers
____ c. the consultant in the area that I was interested in assessing
____ d. my principal
____ e. School district testing coordinator
____ f. there is no one who could provide me with much information and so I would have to find out from a variety of sources on my own

6. I am interested in knowing more about the standardized tests available.

_____ True _____ False

7. Within the other E.C.S.D. divisions, results from the ability (intelligence) test and yearly standardized achievement tests are reported as percentiles and grade equivalents on a "student profile card" yearly. Would you like to see this procedure extended to the Senior High level?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure

8. I feel that such standardized testing might be useful in discussing a student's achievement with the students themselves and/or parents.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure

9. Indicate which of the following areas that you would like to see assessed with standardized tests: (check one or more)

____ a. student's intelligence (ability)
____ b. student's language arts skills
____ c. student's mathematics
____ d. Other subject areas, please specify _____
_____
_____

10. If you would like to see yearly standardized achievement testing carried out at the High School level, what time of the year would you prefer to have the information provided to you?

_____

In what form would you like the information provided to you? (check one or more)

____ a. grade scores
____ b. National percentiles
____ c. Local percentiles
____ d. raw scores
____ e. item analyses
____ f. other (please specify)

11. If you are in favour of this testing, how would you like to use the standardized test information made available to you? (please check one or more)

___ a. instructional planning
___ b. reporting to parents
___ c. indicates accurately student's progress from year to year
___ d. providing information on child's potential to achieve (ability)
___ e. screening for possible special education placement
___ f. other (please specify) _____